NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCLXXXVII.

FEBRUARY, 1889.

THE BUGABOO OF TRUSTS.

We must all have our toys; the child his rattle, the adult his hobby, the man of pleasure the fashion, the man of art his Master; and mankind in its various divisions requires a change of toys at short intervals. The same rule holds good in the business world. We have had our age of "consolidations" and "watered stocks." Not long ago everything was a "syndicate"; the word is already becoming obsolete and the fashion is for "Trusts," which will in turn no doubt give place to some new panacea, that is in turn to be displaced by another, and so on without end. The great laws of the economic world, like all laws affecting society, being the genuine outgrowth of human nature, alone remain unchanged through all these changes. Whenever consolidations, or watered stocks, or syndicates, or Trusts endeavor to circumvent these, it always has been found the result is that after the collision there is nothing left of the panaceas, while the great laws continue to grind out their irresistible consequences as before.

It is worth while to inquire into the appearance and growth of Trusts and learn what environments produce them. Their genesis is as follows: a demand exists for a certain article, beyond the capacity of existing works to supply it. Prices are high, and profits tempting. Every manufacturer of that article immediately proceeds to enlarge his works and increase their producing power. In addition to this the unusual profits attract the attention of his principal managers or those who are interested to a greater or less degree in the factory. These communicate the knowledge of the prosperity of the works to others. New partnerships are formed, and new works are erected, and before long the demand for the article is fully satisfied, and prices do not advance. In a short

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time the supply becomes greater than the demand, there are a few tons or yards more in the market for sale than required, and prices begin to fall. They continue falling until the article is sold at cost to the less favorably situated or less ably managed factory; and even until the best managed and best equipped factory is not able to produce the article at the prices at which it can be sold. Political economy says that here the trouble will end. Goods will not be produced at less than cost. This was true when Adam Smith wrote, but it is not quite true to-day. When an article was produced by a small manufacturer, employing, probably at his own home, two or three journeymen and an apprentice or two, it was an easy matter for him to limit or even to stop production. As manufacturing is carried on to-day, in enormous establishments with five or ten millions of dollars of capital invested, and with thousands of workers, it costs the manufacturer much less to run at a loss per ton or per yard than to check his production. Stoppage would be serious indeed. The condition of cheap manufacture is running full. Twenty sources of expense are *fixed charges*, many of which stoppage would only increase. Therefore the article is produced for months, and in some cases that I have known for years, not only without profit or without interest upon capital, but to the impairment of the capital invested. Manufacturers have balanced their books year after year only to find their capital reduced at each successive balance. While continuing to produce may be costly, the manufacturer knows too well that stoppage would be ruin. His brother manufacturers are of course in the same situation. They see the savings of many years, as well perhaps as the capital they have succeeded in borrowing, becoming less and less, with no hope of a change in the situation. It is in soil thus prepared that anything promising relief is gladly welcomed. The manufacturers are in the position of patients that have tried in vain every doctor of the regular school for years, and are now liable to become the victims of any quack that appears. Combinations—syndicates—trusts—they are willing to try anything. A meeting is called, and in the presence of immediate danger they decide to take united action and form a trust. Each factory is rated as worth a certain amount. Officers are chosen, and through these the entire product of the article in question is to be distributed to the public, at remunerative prices.

Such is the genesis of "Trusts" in manufactured articles.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In transportation the situation, while practically the same, differs in some particulars. Many small railway lines are built under separate charters. A genius in affairs sees that the eight or ten separate organizations, with as many different ideas of management, equipment, etc., are as useless as were the two hundred and fifty petty kings in Germany, and, Bismarck-like, he sweeps them out of existence, creates a great through line, doubles the securities or stock, the interest upon which is paid out of the saving effected by consolidation, and all is highly satisfactory, as in the case of the New York Central. Or a line is built and managed with such sagacity as distinguishes the Pennsylvania Railroad, and it succeeds in developing the resources of the State so extensively that upon a line of three hundred and fifty miles between Pittsburgh and Philadelphia it nets about thirteen millions of dollars per annum. Twelve millions of dollars of this it shows upon its books. From one to two millions extra are expended in making one of the best lines in the world out of a road which was originally designed as a horse-railroad. We do not call our railroad combinations Trusts, but they are substantially such, since they aim at raising and maintaining transportation rates in certain districts. They are "combinations" or "systems" which aim at monopolies within these districts.

During the recent Presidential campaign it suited the purpose of one of the parties to connect Trusts with the doctrine of protection. But Trusts are confined to no country, and are not in any way dependent upon fiscal regulations. The greatest Trust of all just now is the Copper Trust, which is French, and has its headquarters in Paris. The Salt Trust is English, with its headquarters in London. The Wire-rod Trust is German. The only Steel-rail Trust that ever existed was an international one which embraced all the works in Europe. Trusts either in transportation or manufactures are the products of human weakness, and this weakness is co-extensive with the race.

There is one huge combination classed with Trusts which is so exceptional in its origin and history that it deserves a separate paragraph. I refer to the Standard Oil Company. So favorable an opportunity to control a product perhaps never arose as in the case of petroleum. At an early stage a few of the ablest business men that the world has ever seen realized the importance of the discovery, and invested largely in the purchase of property con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nected with it. The success of the petroleum business was phenomenal, and so was the success of these people. The profits they made, and, no doubt, as much capital as they could borrow, were fearlessly reinvested, and they soon became the principal owners, and finally, substantially the only owners of the territory which contained this great source of wealth. The Standard Oil Company would long ago have gone to pieces had it not been managed, upon the whole, in harmony with the laws which control business. It is generally admitted that the prices of oil to the consumer are as low to-day, and many think that they are even lower, than could have been attained had the business not been grouped and managed as one vast concern in the broad spirit for which the Standard oil managers are famous. They are in the position somewhat of the Colemans, of Pennsylvania, who possess the chief source of the ore supply in the East. They own the Cornwall deposit of ore as the Standard Oil Company owns the source of the oil deposit. But as the company has continually to deal with the finding of oil in other localities, the price of its existence and success is the continuance of that exceptional ability in its councils and management displayed by its founders. Threatened opposition arises every now and then, and the chances are greatly in favor of the Standard Oil Company losing its practical monopoly, and going the way of all huge combinations. It is a hundred to one whether it will survive when the present men at the head retire; or perhaps I should say when the present man retires, for wonderful organizations imply a genius at the head, a commander-in-chief, with exceptionally able corps commanders no doubt, but still a Grant at the head. To those who quote the Standard Oil Company as an evidence that Trusts or combinations can be permanently successful, I say wait and see. I have spoken thus freely of that company because I am ignorant of its management, profits, and modes of action. I view it from the outside, as a student of political economy only, and as such have endeavored to apply to it the principles which I know *will* have their way, no matter how formidable the attempt made to defeat their operation.

We have given the genesis of trusts and combinations in their several forms. The question is, Do they menace the permanent interest of the nation? Are they a source of serious danger? Or are they to prove, as many other similar forms have proved,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mere passing phases of unrest and transition? To answer this question let us follow the operation of the manufacturing trust which we have in imagination created, salt or sugar, nails, beams, or lead or copper; it is all the same. The sugar refiners, let us say, have formed a Trust after competing one with another through years of disastrous business, and all the sugar manufactured in the country in existing factories is sold through one channel at advanced prices. Profits begin to grow. Dividends are paid, and those who before saw their property vanishing before their eyes are now made happy. The dividends from that part of a man's capital invested in the sugar business yield him profit far above the capital he has invested in various other affairs. The prices of sugar are such that the capital invested in a new factory would yield enormously. He is perhaps bound not to enlarge his factory or to enter into a new factory, but his relatives and acquaintances soon discover the fresh opportunity for gain. He can advise them to push the completion of a small factory, which, of course, must be taken into the Trust. Or, even if he does not give his friends this intimation, capital is always upon the alert, especially when it is bruited about that a Trust has been formed, as in the case of sugar, and immediately new sugar manufactories spring up, as if by magic. The more successful the Trust, the surer these off-shoots are to sprout. Every victory is a defeat. Every factory that the Trust buys is the sure creator of another, and so on, *ad infinitum*, until the bubble bursts. The sugar refiners have tried to get more from capital in a special case than capital yields in general. They have endeavored to raise a part of the ocean of capital above the level of the surrounding waters, and over their bulwarks the floods have burst, and capital, like water, has again found its level. It is true that to regain this level a longer or a shorter period may be required, during which the article affected may be sold to the consumer in limited quantities at a higher rate than before existed. But for this the consumer is amply recompensed in the years that follow, during which the struggle between the discordant and competitive factories becomes severer than it ever was before, and lasts till the great law of the survival of the fittest vindicates itself. Those factories and managers that can produce to the best advantage eventually close the less competent. Capital wisely managed yields its legitimate profit. After a time, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

growth of demand enables capital to receive an unusual profit. This in turn attracts fresh capital to the manufacture, and we have a renewal of the old struggle, the consumer reaping the benefit.

Such is the law, such has been the law, and such promises to be the law for the future; for, so far, no device has yet been devised that has permanently thwarted its operation. Given freedom of competition, and all combinations or trusts that attempt to exact from the consumer more than a legitimate return upon capital and services, write the charter of their own defeat. We have many proofs that this great law does not sleep and that it will not be suppressed. Some time ago, as I have stated, the steel rail manufacturers of Europe formed a trust and advanced the price of rails to such an extent that American manufacturers were able for the first and perhaps for the last time to export steel rails to Canada in competition with the European. But the misunderstandings and quarrels, inseparable from these attempted unions of competitors, soon broke the Trust. With vindictive feelings, added to what was before business rivalry, the struggle was renewed, and the steel rail industry of Europe has never recovered. It was found that the advance of prices had only galvanized into life concerns which never should have attempted to manufacture rails; and so that Trust died a natural death.

During the great depression which existed for several years in this country in the steel rail trade many anxious meetings were held under circumstances described in the genesis of Trusts, and it was resolved that the plan of restricting production should be tried. Fortunately reaction soon came. A demand for rails set in before the plan went into operation, and, as a matter of fact, no restriction of product was ever attempted, and the steel rail industry was thus saved from a great error.

We have recently seen the Lead Trust of this country shattered and its chief owners brankrupted. The newspapers a few weeks ago were filled with accounts of the convention of the growers of cattle in St. Louis, resolved to break down the combination of slaughterers and shippers in Chicago and Kansas City. No business was poorer in this country for many years than the manufacture of nails. It was overdone. To remedy this the manufacturers did not form a Trust so far as the sale of product was concerned, but they restricted production. A cer-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tain percentage of their machines was kept idle. This percentage was increased from time to time, and only the quantity made that the market would take at a certain price. But the result was that there were soon more machines in America for the manufacture of iron nails added to the works than the demand for nails will require for many years to come, and this combination of nail manufacturers went the way of all Trusts, and left the business in a worse plight than it was in before.

The Sugar Trust has already a noted competitor at its heels. The Copper Trust is in danger. All stand prepared to attack a "trust" or "combine" if it proves itself worth attacking; in other words, if it succeeds in raising its profits above the natural level of profits throughout the country it is subject to competition from every quarter, and must finally break down. It is unnecessary to devote much attention to the numerous Trusts in minor articles which one reads of, a new one appearing every few days and others passing out of existence, because they are all subject to the great law. The newspapers charge that Trusts exist or have existed in wall paper, shoe laces, lumber, coal, coke, brick, screw, rope, glass, school-books, insurance and hardware, and twenty more articles; but the fitting epitaph for these ephemeral creations is

"If I was so soon to be done for.
I wonder what I was begun for!"

We may exclaim with Macbeth, as he watched the shadowy descendants of Banquo filing past, "What, will the line stretch out to the crack of doom?" But as with Banquo's procession, so with Trusts, it is comforting to remember that as one approaches another disappears. They come like shadows, and so depart.

So much for Trusts in the manufacturing department. Let us now examine the railways, whose "pools" and "combinations" and "differentials" alarm some people. In all their various forms, these are the efforts of capital to protect itself from the play of economic forces, centered in free competition. In most cases the stocks of railways have been watered. Calculated upon the real capital invested the dividends of railway lines have been unusual, and much above the return which capital generally has yielded in other forms of investment. The entire capital stock of railways in the West as a rule has cost little or nothing, the proceeds of the bonds issued having been sufficient to build them. The efforts of railway man-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agers to-day are therefore directed to obtain a return upon more capital than would be required to duplicate their respective properties. Their combinations and agreements of various kinds, which come to naught a few months after they are solemnly entered into, are evidences of this attempt. But, just as enormous profits on capital, received from the manufacture of any article, are sure to attract additional capital into the production of the article, so, in like manner, the unusual success of these railroads attracts new capital into their territory. New York Central paying dividends upon its eighty per cent. stock dividend culminates in the West Shore. The Pennsylvania Railroad, earning, as I have said, something like thirteen millions per annum upon its line in Pennsylvania, has its South Pennsylvania. One line between Chicago and Milwaukee being greatly profitable, fortunately brought into existence a parallel road. The two being unusually profitable, fortunately resulted in a third. There was one line between these points, and now there are six; and should the six combine to-morrow and exact from the public one per cent. more return upon capital than the average return, there would soon be seven, and very properly so.

This proves once more that there is no possibility of evading the great law, provided capital is free to embark in competing lines. In Great Britain and throughout Europe generally a different policy has been pursued in regard to railways from that of the free-to-all policy which we have followed. The railways and other transportation routes of Great Britain, in order to get permission to build, have cost nearly as much per mile as our cheapest Western lines have cost to build. Manchester, for instance, has recently decided to construct a canal, thirty miles long, to Liverpool, and the expense incurred in obtaining permission from Parliament to embark capital in this enterprise has cost nearly half a million of dollars up to this date. The Government, through a committee of Parliament, determines whether a proposed line is actually needed, and to settle this point everybody connected with existing transportation facilities in the neighborhood appears before the committee to prove that it is not needed, while the promoters of the scheme are at enormous expense to prove by hundreds of experts that it is. The empirical decision of the committee of the House of Commons on this question is not to be compared with the unerring decision of the capitalists interested.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They know much better than any committee of the Legislature are likely to know whether the work in question will pay a fair dividend, and this is the best proof that it is required. The result of the American policy is seen in the fact that notwithstanding all the attempts upon the part of our railways to thwart the economic laws, nevertheless, the American people enjoy the cheapest transportation in the world. The railway rates upon freight in Europe, compared with those in America, show startling contrasts. The cost of freightage on English lines is upon the average more than double the American charge, and in many cases which I have examined it is three times as great. In not a few cases the British charge is far beyond three times the American.

A friend bought a cargo of grain at Leith, which had paid one dollar per ton freight from New York; it cost him ninety-six cents per ton to transport it thirty-five miles inland. Another purchased six hundred tons charcoal pig-iron upon Lake Superior, which cost four dollars per ton freight to Liverpool; he paid $2.87 per ton to carry it eighty miles inland by rail to his mills. For this amount our trunk lines carry rails five hundred and sixty miles, as against eighty miles in Britain. If Europe enjoyed our advantages of free competition in its transportation system, the development of its resources would be surprising, even at this late day in its history. There is in my opinion only cause for hearty congratulation as regards our railway policy. Its evils are trifling; its advantages over all other systems in the world enormous.

The people of America can smile at the efforts of all her railway magnates and of all her manufacturers to defeat the economic laws by Trusts or combinations, or pools, or "differentials," or anything of like character. Only let them hold firmly to the doctrine of free competition. Keep the field open. Freedom for all to engage in railroad building when and where capital desires subject to conditions open to all. Freedom for all to engage in any branch of manufacturing under like conditions.

There can then be no permanent extortion of profit beyond the average return from capital, nor any monopoly, either in transportation or manufacturing. Any attempt to maintain either must end in failure, and failure ultimately disastrous just in proportion to the temporary success of the foolish effort. It is simply ridiculous for a party of men to meet in a room and attempt by passing resolutions to change the great laws which govern human

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

affairs in the business world, and this, whether they be railway presidents, bankers or manufacturers.

The fashion of Trusts has but a short season longer to run, and then some other equally vain device may be expected to appear when the next period of depression arrives; but there is not the slightest danger that serious injury can result to the sound principles of business from any or all of these movements. The only people who have reason to fear Trusts are those foolish enough to enter into them. The Consumer and the Transporter, not the Manufacturer and the Railway owner, are to reap the harvest.

Even since the foregoing was written, a new form has appeared upon the stage in the shape of "The Presidents' Agreement—an agreement among gentlemen," in which the parties engage to control, strangle and restrict the future development of our magnificent railway system under the laws of natural growth, at a time when the country requires this development as much as it ever did. These gentlemen are not going to engage in building lines which will give the public the benefit of healthy competition, or permit such to be built hereafter. It is safe to say that very soon this toy will be discarded, like its predecessors, for another, and that the very men apparently most pleased with this new rattle will then regard it with the greatest contempt, and go forward in the good work, as hitherto, developing the railway system wherever and whenever they think they see a fair chance for profit. Whenever existing railways exact from the public more than a fair return upon the actual capital invested, or upon the capital which would be required to duplicate existing lines, competing lines will be built—fortunately for the interests of the country—which is much more concerned in getting cheap transportation than it is in insuring dividends for capitalists; and whenever a percentage is to be obtained by the negotiation of railway securities, bankers will be found—also fortunately for the best interests of the country—who will gladly find a market for them without stopping to inquire whether monopolies are to be overthrown by the new lines.

It is not in the power of man to exact for more than a brief season, and a very brief season indeed, unusual profit upon actual capital invested either in Transportation or Manufacture, so long as all are free to compete, and this freedom, it may safely be asserted, the American people are not likely to restrict.

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEXT POLAR EXPEDITION.

THERE is hardly anything more uncertain than conjectural geography, unless it be the surmises as to the course of future expeditions that may convert conjectural into assured geographical matters. But having undertaken to write an article on "The Next Polar Expedition," I approach the subject with a feeling that there can possibly be evolved a series of conjectures, out of which might grow one or two that may prove to be closely allied to prophecy.

The facts on which such conjectures can be based are not very numerous, and more difficult than all, it is hard to give the true value to each from which to reach the deductions. As when a person starts an enterprise in a locality and fails it is not always easy to say whether the locality will not support such an enterprise or whether the manager would not have failed in such an undertaking in about any locality, so when a polar enterprise has encountered disastrous results, it is not always quite clear what it has proven, whether or no the route is an inordinately dangerous one in that land of dangerous journeys, or if the blame is not mostly upon the shoulders of the party that met the unfortunate consequence. It would seem quite clear to a person that if several expeditions had passed safely over a given route, backwards and forwards, and another had fallen wounded by the wayside on the same path, that surely the party and not the path was to blame. But even this is far from being always true, and especially so over polar paths, for there is no element so conspicuous in the disasters of that frigid land as the element of climate, and none so variable. A dozen indifferently managed and carelessly equipped parties may march over a route safely, and one guided by an experienced and intelligent explorer, with all the known resources in his power, receive a disastrous check from this source should a fickle Nature see fit to launch an unusually severe season, or combination of ice-floes and ice-packs against him. I have stood on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the shore of a polar sea that was historic with the horrors of Arctic disaster, and seen it when a yachting jaunt could have been enjoyed on its placid, iceless waters. Therefore, although the subject of danger is a most necessary one to consider in its bearings on the next polar expedition, yet it is nevertheless almost one of too indefinite a nature, from season to season, to consider as being conclusive over some of the routes where such variable results have been obtained as in the past. There is, however, one element of danger in the Arctic, whatever be the route selected, that it is well worth considering, and in which it also differs largely from similar undertakings in other zones of the earth. I refer to the condition of too much preliminary success in an Arctic enterpise not due to the efforts of the party itself. The first successes in almost all undertakings are so generally the most important, as creating an enthusiasm and ardor to carry the projector through the later and probably more difficult parts, that it is hard to conceive that there could be any exception to the rule, but the history of all Hyperborean horrors is that of a too abundant success in the first part of the undertaking, a success that has afterwards proven to be a trap. This is particularly true of naval expeditions, or of the naval efforts of other expeditions where such efforts have led the party through long and tortuous channels of ice-laden waters.

The nearest that any Arctic navigator ever came to accomplishing the Northwest Passage—that goal of all polar exploration for so long a time—was by Sir Robert McClure, of the Royal Navy, in the "Investigator," who, striking a most fortunate season and combination of open water and freedom from ice, got fully three-fourths of the way through from the Pacific side, and within a day's unobstructed sail of points that had been reached by navigators from the Atlantic side, when his seeming good fortune turned, and he was shut up in the Bay of Mercy, as he named it, but which came near being a most unmerciful harbor of refuge to his party, as after events proved. Its salvation was one of the many miracles of that land of miraculous escapes. The next three or four summers were of the usual Arctic character, and, as a consequence, the "Investigator" could not be budged from the Bay of Mercy. Forced to free his party from the frost fettered ship his fate would probably have been akin to that of Sir John Franklin, had not that whole part of the polar

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regions been alive with searchers for the ill-fated Sir John (Sir Robert, too, was bent on the same errand), one of which rescued him just as he was starting on a long desperate trip to the nearest Hudson Bay Company's post, the result of which trip would probably have emphasized the danger of too much good luck in the first part of an Arctic undertaking. We could burden the reader's time with almost a score of similar examples, wherein too much success at first has only added to the seriousness of the disaster after, or more than likely determined the same.

Reviewing this most serious cause of casualties in cold weather climes, it is seen that the weather or other elements are somewhat variable there, so that icy obstructions may be normal for a number of years, and then, for only a season or two, may practically disappear. The Arctic navigator who strikes such an exceptional season is, compared with his predecessors, either extremely lucky or unfortunate, according to whether it allows him to accomplish his main object, or only sets a trap for him to prevent his escape after luring him into the thickest of Arctic obstacles. Baron von Nordenskiöld, the famous Swedish explorer of the polar regions, in forcing the Northeast Passage, struck such a favorable season, and reaped immortality as a result; but the list of those who have only been lured into labyrinths of trouble by such preliminary success is much larger, very much larger, so large in fact that it is possible only to refer to the few cases already spoken of. If "the next polar expedition" should be a pole-seeking one —for, despite the popular belief that all Arctic expeditions are of this character, the proportion of them is really very small—it is evident that this unfortunate ratio will even be increased, for in the light of past disasters it can never be hoped that any season will ever be so favorable as to allow a successful dash to be made to the pole based wholly on the assistance it can render. There must be many other elements joined to this one to accomplish that all-absorbing but sensational feat. In fact, it seems as if the pole was a centre from which radiated a series of these deep channels of water that were no better than traps, somewhat like the snare-nets that boys used to set for quails and partridges, all of which converged to a central net, where the birds were finally forced and killed.

If I were to hazard a guess as to the next polar expedition, I would have but little hesitation in saying that it will probably be a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

North Pole seeking affair, if it is on the Arctic side of the earth, and for scientific objects if it should be into the Antarctic quarter. The reason I infer that the next undertaking towards the North Pole will be to reach that particular point is founded on the facts—or so they appear to me—that the conditions for such an expedition are better than for any other I can now surmise. As the last two or three expeditions in that direction and for that purpose were sensationally disastrous, and as the whole purpose is sensational, they have awakened that peculiar feeling or lines of thought on which such undertakings unwittingly thrive. But while disaster feeds upon itself and starts the ball rolling for the next, better than can any other element, it has its counterpoise in that the patron side of the question—the most important side to effect a materialization—is slower to act the fresher the horrors in the popular mind, unless it be to relieve immediate distress of some recently stranded expedition, which is, of course, a wholly different affair, and prompted by wholly different motives. Therefore, there must be time for the last impressions to have faded away before a projector can expect a patron to furnish him with the funds for an equivalent undertaking.

It is very likely that the next North Polar expedition will not be from the United States, and the reasons therefor are somewhat similar to those that have already been given. The last disaster in this way was from our country, and while it will check the patron side of future undertakings with us, it is not likely to do so to the same extent in foreign lands, where our minor misfortunes are not so widely discussed, and very much less based upon them in reaching any conclusions on any subject. One can appreciate this fact much better when closely following a definite study, as polar exploration, and notice how very little attention is paid in this country to equivalent disasters—to expeditions that have originated from foreign sources. In fact, a general perusal of geographical journals from European countries shows that there is much more talk on that side of the world concerning the probabilities of a polar expedition than is to be found at home. Just at present it seems to be turned toward the Antarctic region, on the basis of a scientific expedition; but that will only have the effect to start this boreal ball rolling in all quarters and in all directions, out of which a North Polar expedition is quite sure to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

grow, if, in fact, there is not more than one. This, again, may be followed in its wake by the usual number of relief and searching parties.

To hazard a guess as to which European country may take the initiative in such an expedition would be much more vague and doubtful. It will more than likely be some of the maritime nations of the northern half of that continent, Great Britain, Germany, Sweden, etc., etc., not only from the greater likelihood of sea-faring people to undertake such expeditions, but also reasoning from the history of European enterprises in the past in these directions. To publish a supposition as to which one of these powers would probably be the base for the next expedition would be a wilder guess than even the wild ones I have already hazarded.

From its very favorable position, and the large amount of excellent material to work with, both as to men and supplies, it would seem that Russia would naturally be chosen as a good country to base an opinion upon. Yet in the light of past events all of the northern explorations of Russia have been of a more substantial and practical character than North Pole seeking expedions, and there is no good reason to believe that she will change her record at this period of time. Still, Russia has been one of the most successful, if not the most successful nation, in her northern undertakings, planning them well and carrying them to practical conclusions; and, leaving out all national considerations, I think any one who has the North Pole's attainment at heart, and who has studied Arctic history, would like to see an expedition bound for the northern axis of the earth composed of the walrus and seal hunters, who every summer ply their hardy vocation around the bleak ice-laden shores of Novaya Zemlya, for the naval contingent, and for the sledgemen, such men as assisted Baron von Wrangell to make his famous journey of two thousand two hundred miles along the frozen shores of Arctic Siberia. If, coupled with a favorable season, such an expedition could not make the pole, I would be willing to chronicle it among the impossibilities until successful aerial navigation, or something equivalent, settled the sensational question for all time to come. But it is not likely that Russia will take a hand in such an expedition for some time, or until science clearly proves that there can be something

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

utilized out of enterprises whose sole direction is the north, until that point is reached where every direction is to the south.

Almost directly north of Russia lies the "Franz-Josef route" to the pole that was first discovered by the Austro-Hungarian Arctic expedition in the "Tegethoff," although its main purpose was to try and determine the navigability of the Northeast Passage. It is probably the route that will be selected by the next pole-seeking expedition, if the united testimony of nearly all Arctic travelers can be relied upon as a basis. More of them have united in recommending this way as the most likely to give successful results than any other I can now recall. It might not be my selection, but I am not called upon to give my opinion as to the best route, but the one the most likely to be followed, should a North Pole expedition be the next one to leave civilization for the polar regions. Its greatest competitor is the Smith Sound route, between northern Greenland and the Parry or Arctic Archipelago. It is probably much harder to reach Franz-Josef Land with a vessel than to secure a footing somewhere in Smith's Sound, but once on this ill-defined island or continent, it seems to present much better facilities for land work or sledging to the pole. Payer made a sledge journey along its western shores within a few miles of the highest northing known, and from where he returned he could still see it trending off to the North and presenting as good sledging as he left when he turned back. Smith's Sound has had the most recent disaster of account in the Arctic, and that, too, is likely to turn future travelers toward Franz-Josef Land. This, it should be remembered, however, has two ship's bones left on its shores, the "Tegethoff's," that bore the discoverers thither, and the "Eiva's," an English private ship under Mr. Leigh-Smith, that ventured too near its ill-fated shores. The coast line character of Franz-Josef Land is much less mountainous than that of Smith's Sound, and it is in this that we find it superior for sledging purposes, and for two reasons. The first, which any one would easily surmise, is found in the fact that the land is naturally more available for sledge dragging, should the party be forced off the ocean ice for any reason, while the second, and by far the most important, although the least understood by those not familiar with Arctic sledging, is in the fact that the lower and less mountainous the land the shallower are the shores, and as a consequence the rough,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hummocky ice (which is simply huge hillocks of ice jammed and frozen together, each berg drawing many feet of water), are stranded at more or less distance from the shore, leaving a narrow but most acceptable strip of smooth salt-water ice between the hummocks and the shore line. Along this strip, however winding it may be, as it follows all the sinuosities of the shore, far better progress can be made with a sledge than by any "cut-offs" that can possibly be made through hummocky ice. It is the most typical case known of "the longest way around is the nearest way home." The subject of sledging is one that is going to enter more largely into the consideration of North Pole seeking expeditions, in that it has been so uniformly successful where judiciously managed, while all the great calamities are more or less directly and indirectly traceable to the maritime side of the expeditions, which have about reached their limits of possibilities in Arctic endeavors, unless a favorable season, or other conditions which they cannot control, temporarily assist them should they be fortunate enough (or unfortunate, as I have explained) to strike them, but on which they can in no wise depend. This subject of hummocky ice therefore is, or certainly ought to be, a very important one in forecasting the probable route of the next polar expedition, whether its object be the North Pole or any other of the many that have lured people to that region.

It is probably not putting it too strong to say that hummocky ice has defeated the purpose of more Arctic sledge parties than all other obstacles put together many times over. The Austro-Hungarian party, in retreating from the ice-imprisoned "Tegethoff," near Franz-Josef Land, made but twelve miles in a month's hard work, and it is seldom that white men can make over a mile and a half a day traveling through it. The Eskimo sledgemen, of course, do much better under equivalent circumstances, but the farthest I ever knew them to make with a fair sized load (about six hundred pounds) was ten miles in fourteen hours' hard work, and this exertion so disabled the native dog-driver that he could not proceed next day, and was noticeably weakened for two or three days after that. From this advantage, then, that Franz-Josef Land has over Smith's Sound, despite the disadvantage of harder maritime approach, I think it safe in asserting that it will be the next route selected to reach the North Pole.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is one route that has been proposed by one of the best Arctic authorities (Parry), where a dare-devil dash for the North Pole may be made some day, although I in no way put it above the Franz-Josef route as the most likely to be taken soon, and that is the route that leads north from Spitzbergen as a base. It has no shores to follow, and the party taking it must put boldly out to sea on the ice which covers it here during the winter and spring, and get back to its base (the northern capes of Spitzbergen) before the ice breaks up and cuts off its retreat. This route was used by Parry, of the Royal Navy, in 1827, when he made the highest northing to that date (in fact it was the first Arctic expedition whose main object was to gain ground in that direction), and his record remained the best for over half a century, until passed by Sir George Nares' party, to be again passed by Lieutenant Greely's a few years later. Parry started on his sledge trip late in the spring and soon found the ice floating south faster than he could travel north, when he returned, having made 82° 45′ N. Getting back to England he urged on the Admiralty the plan of returning to Spitzbergen, which is easily reached by ships, remaining there one winter and starting in the spring a month or two earlier than on his former expedition, or before the fixed ice began drifting south. As a means of beating present records I think Parry's plan a very good one, and one that is comparatively safe for that notoriously unsafe region; but to make to the pole and back before the retreat is cut off it ranks among the wildest of all foolhardy plans in an undertaking given to that order of plans. It is likely that it will be tried some day if the other routes mentioned fail a few times more.

Summing it all up into a sentence, I think that the next polar expedition will be a North Pole seeking one, and that it will emanate from some of the northern European countries, its route being by Franz-Josef Land, with Smith Sound a close second, and a bare possibility of the Spitzbergen route being selected.

I have not considered the proposed German expedition to the Antartic regions, in which it is said that Mr. Henry Villard, of our own country, is so deeply interested, for the reason that being already half formulated, if rumors are to be relied upon, it is past the point where guessing can be allowed in its case. Its object will be purely scientific, in a region but poorly known. It is ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tremely doubtful, in fact, if any South Pole seeking will ever be organized until the North Pole struggle has been settled by a victory. The objects of reaching them are purely the sensational ones of doing a something in which others have failed, so that the North Pole will answer all the purposes of such objects until it is attained, and its greater convenience to the northern nations will also select it as the one with which to battle.

While it is hard, indeed, to cast the hyperborean horoscope as to the next polar expedition, even in the light of past events, it is quite easy, indeed, to say where the next polar expedition should be directed in order to accomplish something worthy of the risks incurred. *I refer to the accurate determination of the north magnetic pole,* a problem that those best informed have pronounced to be of very considerable scientific value, certainly the highest to be found in the polar regions. This point was determined by its discoverer, Sir James Clarke Ross, in 1831, as well as could be done with the instruments of that time, and probably to within an error less than its daily or annual fluctuation; for the magnetic pole, like the magnetic needle of the compass, seems to have its daily, annual and great secular variations. It is this latter, in fact, a slow movement to the westward, that it is so important to determine in order to settle certain problems of terrestrial magnetism that will be of value to that rapidly developing and now very useful science. Magnetic surveys, at great cost and exertion, have been more or less completed in the civilized countries of the world. Lines of equal magnetic declination, lines of no declination, and other magnetic elements have been carefully, and after much labor thoroughly charted over the greater part of the earth, as aids to navigation and other arts more or less dependent thereon. Magnetic observatories have been established in the higher civilized countries for the purpose of observing the changes and variations of the magnetic needle. With all these carefully conducted observations the only *point* of great importance, the north magnetic pole, has not been scientifically determined or observed, owing to its comparatively inaccessible situation in the Arctic regions. It is clearly beyond our space to enter into a discussion of its importance, which has been so often affirmed by leading scientists familiar with terrestrial magnetism, but if the reader would only reflect on the vast and useful progress made recently in magnetism, electro-magnetism and electricity, he can conceive something of its utility and bear-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing; he can, at least, clearly see that it would be more credit to Smith to accomplish this problem than to reach eighty-five degrees north latitude after Jones and Robinson had turned back at eighty-four degrees north, defeated.

Weyprecht, the scientist, originated and elaborated a plan for occupying the "run" of the Arctic regions with temporary scientific observations, and the plan was afterwards carried out, fifteen being so established for a short while. The only point he mentioned as being worthy, and on which he was especially desirous of fixing one of them, was "near the centre of magnetic intensity," and yet none of the fifteen stations were within a thousand miles of this one spot he had selected, and on which he had set his heart, although he had passed to the "silent majority" before his plan was consummated. His view of the North Pole is worthy of mention here as "being of no more significance for science than any other point in high latitudes."

This north magnetic pole is, roughly, about on the intersection of the 70th parallel and the 100th meridian west of Greenwich—two co-ordinates that are always represented on even the smallest maps, and is therefore easily found. To attempt to reach it by the sea, or with a vessel, would be hazardous, as in its immediate vicinity has taken place the greatest number of naval disasters of any district in the polar regions. Small sledge parties, however, have visited it without any calamitous results, and this clearly indicates the nature of the expedition that could safely settle the problem.

It is, beyond all doubt, the next polar expedition that *ought* to be undertaken.

FREDERICK SCHWATKA.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SIN AND UNBELIEF

INTRODUCTION BY THE AUTHOR.

THE following pamphlet was written at Oxford, nearly eight years ago, in March, 1881, by way of a protest, as its title and contents show, against the first of series of Bampton lectures, delivered by Mr. John Wordsworth, then tutor of Brasenose College, now Bishop of Salisbury. It was written in a mood of strong feeling, and printed immediately, by Messrs. Slatter & Rose, the representatives of that firm of booksellers in the Oxford High street by which Shelley's luckless pamphlet was issued in 1811. But, moved probably by natural caution, the printers and publishers omitted to insert any printer's or publisher's name in the little *brochure,* an omission which passed unnoticed by the inexperience of the writer. The said writer, waiting a little tremulously for results on the day of publication, was told, first, that the pamphlet was exciting interest, and that copies were being rapidly sold—then, after a few hours' interval, that the sale had been suddenly stopped by the intervention of a well-known High Church clergyman, who was at the time vicar of a church in Oxford. This dignitary, it appeared, went into Messrs. Slatter & Rose's shop, bought the pamphlet, read it, and instantly noticed that it bore no printer's name. He at once drew the attention of the firm to the circumstance, and to the fact that such an omission is a legal offence. The firm understood that they must either withdraw the pamphlet or suffer for it, and that same evening the whole stock of copies was returned to the author with a letter of regret.

The writer of the "protest" felt some natural indignation, and the matter would probably have been carried further, but for the fact that at the same moment a serious accident overtook the Bampton lecturer, and in the sympathy felt by the whole of Oxford, the feeling which had originally dictated the pamphlet and the irritation caused by its summary suppression were both

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

equally merged. The returned copies were stowed away, and the incident passed out of mind.

It is with some diffidence that I bring this bygone protest in behalf of a liberal religion once more into the light of day. But "Robert Elsmere" seems to have brought me friends in America, and I have had many cordial requests to write for the American public. It will be best for me in the future to confine myself, wholly or mainly, to that type of writing which has already won a hearing. But meanwhile this "protest" is beside me; it contains all the leading thoughts of "Robert Elsmere;" and though seven years of added thought and reading stand between me and it, though the opening is crude, and the whole slight and incomplete, I am not ashamed to-day of its judgments or its aspirations. Both have become more of a commonplace now than they were when these few pages were written. Thought in England is moving fast. The labors and debates of scientific theology, which for half a century have been mainly the occupation and the interest of experts, are now beginning to penetrate the *popular* English mind as they have never done before. To judge from the Manchester Church Congress of this year, and from many recent books on religious subjects, marked by a fresh type and character, we are now fairly in the beginning of an epoch of *popularization* which may have enormous results for our religious life and institutions. It has taken fifty years of absorbing industry and exhaustive debate—Strauss's "Leben Jesu" appeared in 1835—to form in the mind of the student of to-day a picture of Christian origins, such as the student of half a century ago could not have conceived, and which by its essential and convincing truth is destined to pass, slowly perhaps, but certainly, from the few to the many. The earlier irrational view of the Old Testament is practically broken down. When bishops, deans and divinity professors join with the mass of educated lay opinion in disavowing it, the victory for the liberal side may be regarded as won. Round the New Testament our own English struggle is only beginning. Here the work of popularization is all to do. We shall not be very largely affected by those results of criticism which have been gained mainly by foreign students, working under conditions of freedom to which English theology cannot and does not wish to pretend, until those results have been assimilated, remolded and reclothed by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the English brain. We still look for an English "Leben Jesu," or an English "Urchristenthum" which shall deal with these great subjects freely and scientifically, and at the same time with a tone and accent to which English feeling can respond. Learning has no nation; the scholar is cosmopolitan; but each people has its own spiritual language, and the accumulations of the scholar must take shape in their language before they can affect the multitude. To this work of translation, so to speak, and presentation, many of those who ponder the story and the destiny of Christianity will do well to turn themselves in the years that lie before us. The religious harvest of the future is whitening on every side. *Faith* need fear nothing. There was never more of it than there is to-day in the midst of what we call our age of doubt. But the forms and agencies of faith have their vast importance in our relative world, and it is they which need change and adjustment. The Positivist exclaims against the loss of time and energy which seem to him involved in the process; the believer in the life "hid with Christ in God" replies that nothing is or can be wasted which tends to refresh the springs of action in mankind, or to kindle in the individual that force of spiritual affection and desire which alone can keep him constant to the great ideals of the race.

A PROTEST.

[ADDRESSED TO THOSE WHO ATTENDED THE BAMPTON LECTURE OF SUNDAY, MARCH 6, 1881.]

"OTHERS, I doubt not, if not we,
The issue of our toils shall see;
And (they forgotten and unknown)
Young children gather as their own
The harvest that the dead had sown."

[*Extract from Syllabus of Bampton Lecture, delivered First Sunday in Lent, March* 6, 1881.—"The present unsettlement in Religion.—Its relation to the movement of civilization.—Sense of injustice often felt in a time of transition.—Book of Job.—Christ, however, connects unbelief and sin.—Moral causes of unbelief, (1) Prejudice, (2) Severe claims of religion, (3) Intellectual faults, esp. Indolence, coldness, recklessness, pride and avarice."]

The first Bampton Lecture of the present series had been expected with much interest. The character and attainments of the lecturer attracted to St. Mary's many beyond the range of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

personal friends or official attendants. A syllabus had, indeed, been circulated beforehand, which, while it had rejoiced some by its promise of plain speaking, had repelled and saddened others. But even among those so repelled there were many who went to hear Mr. Wordsworth* last Sunday, believing that behind the narrowness of personal view indicated by the syllabus, there would still be visible in his lectures the learning and the religious power which he is known to possess, learning and power from which even those might profit who knew themselves to differ widely from him. To what extent this conviction may be rewarded in later lectures it is, of course, impossible to say. As far as the first lecture was concerned, at any rate, it found but small confirmation. Mr. Woodsworth delivered a sermon to which many among his senior hearers must have listened in almost equal pain and wonderment. Is this all, one asked, that a religious preacher at the centre of English intellectual activity, whose business it is to make a study of religious thought and of the religious life in man, can tell us about that great movement of the human mind against the traditional Christian theology which is to many of us the most important fact of our day and age? Does he see no further, does he understand no more than this? And, if so, whence comes a blindness so absolute and a narrowness so complete?

This must have been the first feeling of many. The second, perhaps, may have been one of willing excuse for the preacher himself. The relief of such an utterance as that of last Sunday must have been very great. The strain upon the religious position is nowadays painfully felt by those who are its pledged defenders. The dissent from orthodox opinion, amid which so many orthodox people are compelled to live, produces an inevitable irritation, to which the finest natures must at times yield. And to an orthodox clergyman, cut off by the nature of things from understanding the higher forms of what he calls "Unbe-

*As this "protest was originally called forth by a particular event, the name of an individual remains necessarily connected with it. In republishing it I would have effaced the signs in it of place and circumstance, but that the little piece of writing would so lose what actuality and life it possesses. Naturally the name of the lecturer, who is now the earnest and devoted Bishop of Salisbury, is here only as representing a moral and intellectual position. Still, if I were writing this first paragraph to-day, the expressions in it would be less emphatic. The more personal gentleness in controversy, the more hope of truth for oneself or of conviction in others,—the years bring no more penetrating lesson with them as they pass.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lief," and therefore affected by no balancing and modifying considerations, the lower forms of it are often inexpressibly trying and disquieting. If he is moreover an Oxford tutor and living much among young and immature men, he naturally sees a great deal of the purely disadvantageous and disastrous side of the loosening hold of Christian sanctions upon human life. Moral deterioration as the direct result, or at least as the marked accompaniment of changed opinions, has come more than once within his personal experience. What such deterioration proves is no more than the natural antagonism as old as humanity, between the "flesh" and the "spirit," between "the natural man" and the "things of God," but granted the orthodox standpoint, the orthodox conclusion, with all its insensibility to other aspects of the question, is yet intelligible—"unbelief is sin, and always implies the antecedent presence of moral evil in the unbeliever."

It may indeed be remembered that the Bampton Lecturer of last Sunday has had a far wider experience than this open to him had he chosen to use it. This University might have supplied him with types of unorthodox belief of a very different character from the jejune and reckless free-thinking of the self-indulgent undergraduate or young fellow. There are men in our midst, some of whom are probably well known to each one of us, in whom the highest points of Christian character are combined with a slowly-formed and firmly-held conviction of the hollowness of the claims made by the popular Christianity upon the reasonable faith of men. But to the preoccupied controversialist, burning with what he believes to be a supernatural message, and honestly indignant with all that stands in the way of its reception, such lives are either practically unknown for lack of understanding faculty on his side, or if he is in any way able to appreciate them, they represent to him a mystery which like so many other orthodox "mysteries" he does not allow to trouble his modes of argument. In this way only can such a sermon as this of Mr. Wordsworth's be understood. On the one hand, a mind in passionate possession of a half-truth, entirely convinced, that is to say, of the frequent connection between low standards of character and unorthodox beliefs; on the other hand a practical incapacity for understanding, or for admitting into the argument, the related and equally demonstrable truth, of the frequent connection between the *highest*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

standards of character and this same order of beliefs; here are the two factors in this strange result. Such an intellectual temper is obviously not to be reasoned with. It will find the Nemesis which follows upon all sacrifices of the greater truth to the lesser, upon all failures in intelligence and in sympathy. But it is scarcely to be directly argued against—even if such an argument were not, in theological controversy, a slaying of the slain.

It will be well, however, while the impression of Mr. Wordsworth's sermon is still fresh upon us, to endeavor to make plain to ourselves what kind of lives these are which his theory of unbelief and sin professes to explain to us. It is quite evident to the Bampton Lecturer that unorthodox belief is a kind of practical arm-chair philosophy adopted for very sufficient practical reasons. A man finds the exercise of his religion inconvenient and uncomfortable. It asks too much from weak human nature. Not only its ideal demands but the conditions of its every-day maintenance are too hard. The undergraduate or the young fellow, absorbed in the quiet and comfort of college rooms, is apt to find an easy chair and a book more attractive than college chapel. At the same time a clever man finds himself called upon to acknowledge that cleverness is of infinitely less worth than godliness and that there are many things in the world which are not open to him to judge, but which have been judged for him already; and against concessions of this kind vanity rebels. In Mr. Wordsworth's eyes it is all so delightfully simple. Self-indulgence, vanity,—in these two words may be summed up the whole great change which all around us is writing its indelible mark upon human society.

Perhaps in the place of the direct argument we have no taste for attempting, it may be permitted to us to place beside the description thus confidently given of the genesis of unbelief, sketches of two types of life. The types may be verified by each one of us who will take the trouble to question his own experience sufficiently closely; to deny that they exist is only to put the denier out of court. The majority of orthodox people at the present day are in fact prepared to admit, however reluctantly, the existence in ever increasing numbers of the first type. They will be more inclined perhaps to question the accuracy of the second. But as with bodily so with intellectual features—the sitter is not always the best

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

judge of his own likeness. In the first place, however, let us endeavor to define what "unbelief," on its intellectual side, really means. It means a particular way of judging a series of documents and events, a particular view of the nature of historical evidence, or of the qualities of historical testimony in given ages of human development. Since the Christian system is a vast historical product depending upon innumerable historical records, "unbelief," which is a particular mode of judging this system, must, intellectually speaking, be a matter of literary and critical judgment. The Christian problem, as the world is now beginning to understand, is first and foremost a literary problem. *A priori,* for instance, there is no tenable argument against miracles, but a wider literary and historical experience shows us how they arise, and that in certain states of human development they always do and must arise. To assume a power of judging the popular Christianity from inside, from the standpoint of intuition and "spiritual certainty," without a knowledge of its relations and conditions as a great literary and historical problem, is to hide one's head in the sand. It may be desirable that the mass of mankind, who have no gift for unraveling literary problems, should continue to hide their heads in the sand, but the fact remains, and cannot be seriously disputed. The Christian question is a question of documents, of minute and intricate series of facts, of a long course of historical development, on the one side of doctrine, on the other of organization—matters all of them for the trained literary critic, to be judged in the temper and by the methods now universally applied to similar classes of fact. Here, however, Mr. Wordsworth would join issue with us. The Christian problem, he would say, is indeed to a large extent a literary problem, but it is *not* to be judged "in the temper and by the methods now universally applied to other classes of fact." We must in reality address ourselves to it in a spirit wholly unique and peculiar. Reason, indeed, is the only instrument by which we can intellectually apprehend anything. Reason must therefore be our instrument in this case, but in this problem alone of all problems success is impossible unless reason is re-enforced by feeling, unless we *hope* to find an affirmative answer to the question, "Is orthodox Christianity true?" Unless, that is, we enter upon the investigation with our minds

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

already half made up, and powerfully affected by those passions of love and fear which the philosophies of all ages have endeavored to exclude from the processes of argument, failure, *i. e.*, a negative answer, is probable, and to this failure moral evil will attach. It is to be accounted for by some form of sin, by pride, by indolence, by selfishness and worldliness of temper, and so on.

How does such an assumption fit with the actual processes of intellectual and spiritual development going on around us? Let us suppose that two young men of similar gifts and position in life are entering upon manhood and taking their places in this University. Both perhaps have been brought up in religious homes, and both are reverent and high-minded, clinging with unquestioning loyalty and fidelity to the ideals and the doctrines they have been trained to accept. In both the inner life is real and active, and Christianity a fact of no merely inherited and traditional significance. A, however, has perhaps been rather more subjected to literary influences than C, and he is naturally of a more fearless and positive temper, inclined to liberalism in politics, boyishly ardent for reforms as such, and in love very likely with certain special social and administrative projects within the hearing of which he has been brought up. He has the curiosity to boot, which is the natural accompaniment of youth and untried abilities. Turn him into a library and it is his eager desire to explore these books with their famous titles, and so to gather round the great names which meet his eye and ear perpetually in his new University life, the ideas which belong to them. The world of books, which perhaps throughout a healthy and conscientious school life has been of little comparative importance to him, becomes now absorbingly real and attractive. He learns how to read and he begins to think. If he has the literary, as distinct from the more strictly scientific bias, he will be variously tempted by all kinds of reading, by history, by criticism, by poetry. For a long time his reading is a mere matter of curiosity and enjoyment to him. He is too untrained to be able to deduce any general ideas from it, and it has little or no effect upon the body of habits he has inherited from home training. His Sunday is spent as he believes his home people would wish him to spend it, and the religious services of a University town are full of interest and pleasure for him. The world indeed for him, is full of interest and variety, of genius and of goodness, and the moment

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for attempting to explain it has not yet come. It is enough merely to explore and to enjoy.

But the process of assimilation goes on, and the boy grows into the man. The reading for Responsions and for Moderations is exchanged for the reading for Greats. Meanwhile, during his leisure time and in vacations, he has been accumulating a great stock of miscellaneous ideas and impressions from books, and in the course of this accumulation the mind has been growing and the intellectual faculty hardening. The period of comparison arrives for him, as it arrives for nations and for sciences. His knowledge has to be sifted, to be put in order, to be penetrated with ideas, to take its place in relation to life and in relation to religious belief. The process of this new intellectual operation is slow and often half conscious. But as he follows it he becomes for the first time *really* alive to a fact which had been up till now a mere shadow to him. It becomes strikingly plain to him that there are large numbers of persons in the present, and that there have been large numbers of persons in the past, of many of whom he knows that he cannot pretend to be the equal either in character or ability, who are wholly unprepared to accept the particular explanation of the facts of the world and human life which he has been taught to regard as essential. Once made aware of these fundamental diversities of view, they become to him for a time the overmastering fact.

They are forced upon him by his Greats reading ; they appear to him in books and subjects, which he had handled of old in light-hearted unconsciousness. And then comes the question, so right, so inevitable, "If there are so many ways of thinking, is it possible, is it probable that my way of thinking is the only right one?" But he remembers that it is not his way of thinking only. Orthodox Anglicanism has been fortified by much writing, by the energies of many lives, by the growth of a long tradition. Burdened with his first doubts, he betakes himself to the aids of Christian fellowship, to the resources of his home ties, to the supports of Christian worship. And these for a time suffice, his unbelief appears to him a sin to be striven against, and the questions so long preparing, and in reality so irresistible, are for a time driven back. But the force of slowly-matured powers and accumulated circumstances is not to be so neutralized. In such a mood as he has now reached he might have fled into the mountains with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

St. Benedict, and so crushed for ever the perilous questionings. But modern life has to be faced and cannot be escaped as could the life of the fifth century. The struggle returns, inevitably returns by the mere progress of life and thought. His intellectual training, this keen and varied instrument he has been for so long unconsciously maturing, begins to work, whether he will or no, upon the whole field of philosophical ideas; it has perfected itself upon a succession of literary problems—it attacks now, whether he will or no, the great literary problem of Christianity. It matters little whether he gives the process direct encouragement. In all probability he refrains from reading books which he knows would harass his religious belief. But the belief is, notwithstanding, harassed and strained perpetually. In his historical and philosophical reading, in the incidents of every-day life, in newspapers, in periodicals, in sermons above all, the inner disturbance finds incessant aggravation. At last a question of authorship, an attempt to sift some half-legendary material, or to estimate the value of a given writer's testimony, under certain ascertained conditions of time and place, will suddenly lead him direct by the natural transitions of thought, into comparisons, into analogies and inferences, from which, after long pondering, he awakes to find a new, and as it seems to him, bewildering and terrible light breaking upon life. Thenceforward it is of little importance how the change thus initiated is carried on, whether he undertakes an elaborate examination into the claims of orthodox Christianity, or whether the detachment from his early beliefs remain still indirect and gradual in operation. In the end the Time Spirit conquers, and long before his triumph is acknowledged to the soul, the Christian religion is dumbly felt to have been drawn within the circle of scientific inquiry, and to have been there stript of its peculiar pretensions. When full recognition of the altered state of things arrives, it brings with it the no longer avoidable confession that the whole vast system of dogmatic Christianity, with all its lovely and imposing associations, is but one of many systems that human nature has in turn framed for its shelter and support, that like all other theologies the world has seen, it is the product of human needs and human skill.

What follows? Inevitably a time of struggle and of blankness, when all ths landmarks of life and conduct appear to waver, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the bitterness of lost certainty makes itself abundantly felt. Is the Christian's happy certainty of an ideal purpose in this life and an ideal justice in the next indeed a delusion? Is there really no rest in God, no peace in Christ? Has the gracious figure of Galilee and of Calvary in reality no significance different in kind from that which attaches to the other heroic and tender figures which have illumined human history? Is there indeed no certainty of our whence, no news of our whither? Is death the end? And if so, of what unrelenting power are we the bruised and helpless playthings?

But if the mind we have been describing is of temper fine enough to bear the strain, its history will not end here. With some men less richly dowered by nature with the religious gift, such a crisis would lead to an attitude of pure agnosticism, and life would be to them henceforward confessedly inexplicable. In matters of conduct they would claim to be guided by the aggregate experience of civilized mankind, and according to the relative degrees of moral cultivation or moral sensitiveness in each case, this experience would represent a higher or a lower standard. In poetry, in human relationships, in natural beauty, they would look for the soothing or stimulating forces necessary for the sustenance of moral life at all. But in the case we have been considering we have been dealing throughout with a strongly religious temperament, combined with a keen and honest intellectual faculty. The intellect has now had its satisfaction, but the needs of the inner life become only the more pressing. It is dimly felt that in work, in unselfishness, in charity, may be found the bridge from the present chaos to some surer spiritual ground. Some hard intellectual task, helped forward by homely self-denial and varied by some quiet work of charity or public usefulness is accordingly undertaken. Life and thought flow on, blindly and painfully often, but by patient effort, by resolute sincerity, the soul is slowly nearing its appointed goal. Months or years may pass, but the end is not the less sure. To the heart that has been darkened by the eclipse of old ideals, God, the Highest Ideal, at last reveals Himself. In a region far removed from the trains of thought and argument which had broken down for him the claims of received opinions; far out of reach of all questions of criticism and exegesis, of historical development and historical method, the soul rises to the source of Love,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Truth, of Beauty, and finds consolation. There are difficulties here, indeed, which the intellect allows and faces. But in the high region of philosophic possibilities, such a nature as we have imagined embraces the possibility which satisfies it most deeply, and this possibility will be—God.

Here, then, at last is rest and permanence. For this is ground which has never been and never can be successfully attacked. God cannot be proved from outside, but neither can He be disproved. No perfecting of the historical method, no comparative handling of religions, can cut the ground from under this faith. Other men, he feels, are free to disbelieve it. But he feels also with joy unspeakable that he is free to believe it, and the kernel of the inner life thus saved, he begins to construct its whole anew.

And as the reconstruction proceeds he recovers all that is permanent in Christianity. He finds again the Master, no longer disguised from him by the veils whether of ignorant love or of intellectual subtlety, but living, true, intelligible, the man Christ Jesus. He makes the name of Christian his own once more, and will assert his right to it no less passionately than reasonably. In the present and in the future he looks for a regenerate Christian society, purified by submission to the Divine education of the world, but as fervent and as high-minded as of old. Meanwhile life is summed up for him in two relations, his relation to God, and his relation to this ideal Christian society. "*In Thee, O Lord, have I put my trust,*" expresses the spirit of the first, while the second, which contains his practical every-day life, with its work, its charities, its tolerances, will be regulated and inspired by words long known to him and now infinitely widened in meaning, "*This do in remembrance of me.*"

But while the Christian passion in its purest form thus revives in him, it leads him to make no compromise with truth. If miracles, however innocently manufactured, are untrue in fact and misleading in philosophy, if the Creeds, therefore, are a mere collection of propositions, venerable for their antiquity and associations, but in no way binding on the enlightened conscience; if the Bible represents an important section of the religious life of mankind, but a section only, to be handled and judged like other sections,—he will endeavor to let these truths also, secondary as they are, express themselves in his life. He will

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not profess to belong to a Church which, by its accredited officers and accepted formulæ, regards the Creeds and the miracles as the essential basis of Christian belief. The loss of common worship he will feel simply and seriously as a loss and a privation, but it will appear to him his duty to bear it. Only by perfect sincerity, by such consistency as it is in his power to reach, can he advance the future he desires. The development he traces in himself he believes and knows to be progressing in many other hearts. By and by will come the time for union and for action. Meanwhile he will not betray the cause of Truth, which is the cause of every child about him for whom the new world is to be framed, by joining in any dream of compromise or any premature schemes of Church Reform, the object of which may be to obscure and reconcile differences which seem to him—at the present moment in the world's history—vital. The differences must be felt, must be acknowledged; the ground must be cleared, then may come the re-building.

Now let us put beside this type of character so real, so increasingly frequent among us, another type not less real, and very much more frequent.

In the case of C the balance of temperament is perhaps slightly different. The whole man is a little slower and more timid than in the case of A. Instead of a bias toward change, there is a natural bias against it, strengthened, perhaps, by the circumstances of home life, by the politics of his family or of his circle. At the same time he has considerable intellectual power, and his career at school, or at college, will, for a while, be scarcely distinguishable in main outlines from that of A. He has very much the same religious opinions as A, for a time neither more nor less strongly held. And he too has to pass under the yoke, has to endure the questioning of the modern spirit which cannot now be escaped by any average intelligence. Again, we have disturbance and recoil, but the disturbance is less great, and the recoil, speaking broadly, is permanent. From the beginning those who knew him might have prophesied the worsting of the scientific instinct by the religious in case of conflict. All his natural timidity and conservatism re-enforces the religious side, and the result is never really doubtful. The risks on all hands of free scientific inquiry are felt to be too great, the mind cannot face them, and the conscience is soon taught that there is no need to face

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them. Orthodox friends are at hand to assure him that the inquiry is itself sinful, and that to make it is merely to waste the forces of his moral and spiritual life. Can he expect to reach a higher and a wider truth than has been reached by those about him whom he has been taught from his childhood to respect and revere? Before, therefore, he has even grasped the elementary conditions of the problem, the young man consciously takes his stand for orthodoxy. Thenceforward nothing is less free to him than thought. Intellectual activity indeed of many kinds, thanks to the vastness of human knowledge, is still open to him, within the strictest limits of orthodoxy.

The mind becomes learned in many things having once consented to be ignorant of some, and with the compromise the whole man is more than content. Upon any inquiry into disputed points, if such inquiry is ever forced upon him by the course of his future life, he will enter in the spirit inculcated by Mr. Wordsworth, that is to say, in the strong hope, or rather in the practical certainty of finding the particular answer he desires. A soldier might as well go to battle having first deliberately disarmed.

With what subtlety and passion, with what delicate ingenuity, the conservative temper whether in religion or politics, once adopted, may be fed from within and without, till all opposed to it becomes a mere shadow or vexation, the history of the world can testify. But neither passion nor ingenuity can alter the fact, or stay truth. The man who cherishes it to the stunting and dwarfing of other powers in him than the religious, has his reward, but he has also his punishment. Arrived at maturity, perhaps landed safely in Holy Orders, he is no longer able to read a critical book with fairness and intelligence, or to understand any but the coarsest aspects of the liberal and scientific school of thought. He is like a man who has lost his sense. In old days it may have been "I will not accept such and such a conclusion," now it is quite naturally, "I cannot." The power of free judgment and appreciation is gone, and he rejoices in its departure. Such a power is only compatible with "unbelief," and "unbelief is sin:" sin, not only in himself, in the only case of which he truly knows the history, but sin in all other cases, in men of whom he knows nothing within or without but the one bare fact of their "opinions."

This is a view which once adopted will often give great per-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sonal relief to a good man sorely troubled by the religious prospects of the present day, and as life goes on, like many other orthodox formulæ it will receive perpetual "confirmation." The holder of it interprets by its aid the careless and self-indulgent life of a free-thinking friend or pupil. Every moral lapse in the case of such a man has a niche in the orthodox scheme. It proves what it is asked to prove, and of any other kind of proof, in a particular range of subjects, the observer has long trained himself to take no heed. Human nature is happily illogical, and with what sweetness and gentleness of personal character such a view is compatible we all know. The loss of power to translate it into tyrannical action has led in God's teaching of the world to the loss of desire so to translate it. But not the less does such a position represent a spiritual evil and defect, not the less is it a danger and an obstacle to the harmonious growth of human society. To the man holding it, understanding of A's life is henceforth impossible. He could not understand it if he would. If he is ever brought intimately across him in such a way as to be made to feel his nobility and purity of nature, he will dismiss the problem of his life as one of those mysteries with which a Christian is not bound to meddle. God knows best for what purpose evil is sometimes endowed with such fair outer semblance, but that unorthodox opinions are themselves sin, and spring from sin, is an explanation of the puzzles of the day so interwoven with all his habits of thought that repeated experiences of the kind will make little or no impression upon him. He has darkened his own eyes, and the good he is incapable of perceiving passes him by, to make its due impression in the Divine purpose on other souls less closely barred against it.

Such lives as we have described under the head of A are known to all of us. They are known, indeed, to men of the Bampton Lecturer's persuasion. But by others they are not only known but understood. Young hearts still open and generous can be fired by their devotion, by their unworldliness, by their width of cultivation and of sympathy. Older men in whom the religious sense properly so called has not been dulled or overlaid by controversy or by dogmatic zeal are drawn to them, and are able to acknowledge the Divine Presence in them, across whatever differences of creed or practice. In the stir of towns, in college rooms, in quiet country houses, an increasing number of such lives are lived amongst

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

us year by year. Silently, but surely, they are preparing us for a new religious order. Misunderstood on both sides, on the scientific as well as on the religious, they are, nevertheless, children of the new household of faith, first-fruits of that new Garden of the Lord whose scheme and plan is even now visible among us. Their presence betokens the first stirrings of a religious movement, which has given many premonitory, and as it has often seemed abortive, signs, but which is now truly upon us, and of which no one can foresee the results. When shall this stir become visible activity and progression? When shall we see the rise of that simpler Christian society which will achieve what the present Christian society on the showing of its own defenders is daily failing to achieve, the recovery of the religious spirit in modern life? The materials are ready, the forces to be employed are daily ranging themselves more clearly. On the one hand the Time Spirit representing whether in the ignorant or in the wise the accumulated labor of generations, the spread of a truer historical sense, the conquests of the critical method—on the other, the eternal and undying need of the human soul for religion, for God. On the continent where the current Christianity has failed far more conspicuously than it has yet failed in England, rational religion is felt on all hands to be the one crying and desperate need. How to provide it may be said to have become the problem of statesmen. Between Materialism and Ultramontanism, where is the third course which society must find? Can it be maintained now, as it was in some sense maintained in the sixteenth century, that Protestantism, Anglican, Dissenting or Lutheran, is in a condition to offer this third course to European thought? We all know, if we will be candid with ourselves and our experience, that it cannot. Protestantism is in worse case philosophically, and has infinitely less chance with the modern world than the Catholicism it displaced.

No. This *via salutis* so ardently desired can be reached in one way only—by making just and equal provision for the two guiding forces of human nature, the force of reason and that spiritual force which we call faith. Protestantism in a younger stage of European society professed to make such a provision, and for a time it succeeded admirably. But we now see that the success of the sixteenth century was nothing more than a step in an inevitable journey. We have reached the end of a long and toil-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some stage, and already the disclosures of the next are rising dimly before the imagination of many of us. We see a Christian Church bound together by simple observances, by a rite of entrance such as was the primitive rite of Christian baptism, by a ceremony of membership which will be the Christian breaking of bread, and by such links of religious custom as may best meet the practical needs of our modern life. The creed of such a Church would be practically summed up in the two sayings we have already quoted as guiding the two-fold course of an individual life:

In thee, O Lord, or *In Thee, O Eternal, have I put my trust.*

And again:

This do in remembrance of me.

Trust or faith,—memory, or love,—these will be the springs of the future as they have been the springs of the past. But the Church of the future will demand a stronger trust from its members than is demanded by what we call orthodox Christianity. It will demand a trust in God, independent of all "schemes of revealed religion," independent even of all certainty of an immortal life, a trust absolute, complete, and unreserved. Such a faith will be called upon to meet suffering and death, without any confident assurance—whatever be its inmost hope*—of the "many mansions" in the Father's house, and it will be called upon to meet life and its perplexities without any cut and dried formulæ of explanation. But in life and death it will find God, and God will suffice it. In daily submission to His will as it has been slowly revealed in human history, and written in the human conscience, in daily communion with Him through all that is highest and noblest in human thought, it will find the stay which nothing else can give. But it will not belie its own nature by asking of God a special and artificial instead of a natural and universal Revelation, nor will it attempt to serve Him by ignorance of His own laws of life and thought.

* "But what, you ask me,"—said Elsmere once, in a speech to the New Brotherhood, which no biographer has reported,—"is the individual hope under such a system of thought? Because of the resurrection of Christ, the Christian looks forward to a continuance of personality beyond death. He sees the supposed fact undermined with terror, because he imagines that the dearest hope of humanity perishes with it. Not so! That hope rests on no uncertain testimony of unknown witnesses to a single past fact. It rests for us, like our faith in God, on the whole of the present—on the whole of the past. Look with me into such dying eyes as those I watched yesterday! [The allusion is probably to the speaker's friend and helper, the little gas-fitter, Charles Richards.] Tremble with me before that last divine thing—a man's conquest of pain and agony and fear, at the moment of death, that he may pour all the poor

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And to the force of trust in a Divine Goodness will be added the inspiring memory of human love and human heroism. *This do, in remembrance of me*,—not in mystical non-natural remembrance, but in simple practical remembrance of actual human suffering and actual human words. In the memory of Christ will be summed up the memory of all who have lived or died in his spirit since history began. But for us of the modern European world which has been molded by Christianity, the name of Jesus of Nazareth must always remain the most powerful and effective symbol at once of man's aspiration to God, and God's victory in man. To break altogether with the Christian tradition, is, for those who cherish the spiritual life at all, an impossibility. To endeavor to do so in the case of any new organization would show not only spiritual insensibility but ignorance of the main lessons of life and history. The problem is how to replace Christianity of one type by Christianity of another. The Christianity of the future is stirring throughout Europe. It is comparatively formless and voiceless, but form and voice must come. There is a day of revealing which arrives sooner or later for "the thoughts of many hearts," and when that revealing comes, it will bring action and energy with it.

Of the practical aims of such a Church as we have thus roughly

remaining energies of the soul into a thought for another, into gratitude, into a sublime trust. *There* is your hope! Millions of years the universe has labored for the evolution of that conquest, that sublimity of trust. All life, all civilization have existed for one end only, the evolution, the perfecting, the training of what we call the soul—of the moral life of man. The making of the soul—the self-realization of God—there, for the believer, is the purpose of the world. But a man has no soul till he has grasped and made his own some fragment of the Divine life. Evil has no permanence, no reality. It is one of the incidents of that vast but fugitive process by which the higher consciousness of man has been fashioned, and that Beauty which is Truth and Love has been made manifest amid the broken shows of the world. As to the future, we cannot draw for you the fashion of the City of God; we can only bid you possess yourselves of a hope which is the eternal heritage of man. That hope can only grow in you, gradually, as you are worthy of it. Live the life of love, patience and reason,—and suddenly, through your utmost gloom, your extremest doubt, there will penetrate those visitings of God, that incommunicable certainty of life in Him which will be to you what the belief in the material resurrection was to St. Paul. After days of toil, of wholesome effort for yourself and others, of justice towards your neighbor, there will come the moment of *vision* which will reward, illumine all.

> "*Unsummoned powers the blinding film shall part.*
> *And scarce by happy tears made dim, the eyes*
> *In recognition start!*

"And after that vision, though your actual knowledge will be no greater, your *trust* will be invincible. It will inspire you through life; it will carry you, as it carried Jesus, through death."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

outlined, this is not the place to speak. How strong a force it might be in social progress, in the combat with physical and moral evil, all of us can imagine. On each side of it there would be large sections of men influenced by other ideas, and guided by other faiths. On one side there would always be a certain number of minds disinclined to any positive solution whatever of the religious difficulty; on the other, there is little prospect of any speedy decline of the principle of authority, which in one shape or another is an essential factor in human history. But for a great intermediate mass of intelligent and craving mankind such a new Christian organization would provide shelter and working ground, and we should see our children spared the waste of spiritual power, the dissipation and wreck of religious feeling, which has too often marked the inevitable struggle of the present.

Meanwhile it is well that such sermons as that delivered by Mr. Wordsworth, should by their mere inadequacy draw attention from time to time to the true nature of some modern "unbelief." More harm is done to rational religion by less plain speaking. The orthodox case, put as the Bampton lecturer put it, has only to be stated to be refuted by the most powerful of all arguments—experience.

MARY A. WARD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FALSE MODESTY IN READERS.

THERE are thousands upon thousands of playgoers—excellent and useful members of the community—who are too liberal and well balanced to fear contamination from seeing a drama acted, yet would shrink with horror from any contact with the world behind the scenes. Henry S. Leigh, author of the graceful "Carols of Cockayne," hits off a type of this class in his lines entitled "Behind the Scenes":

> "I was a youngster at the time,
> Just verging on my teens,
> And fancied that it must be 'prime'
> To go *behind the scenes.*
> I ventured to express the same
> In quite a candid way,
> And shock'd my aunt—a sober dame,
> Though partial to the play."

Does not the attitude of such people figure pretty fairly that of many readers, who are pleased with a work of fiction so long as it presents a certain artificial resemblance to life, but begin to clamor against it if they find that it is too nearly true to actual human existence? They do not want a novel to be too real, too outspoken—especially when it deals with vicious or immoral actions. They know perfectly well that such actions constantly occur in the world; that these actions are gross, abominable and unmitigated, when contemplated as actual facts; but they do not like to have this truth brought out plainly in fiction. They want to have the fiction seem very nearly like life; yet, to please them, it must ignore a good deal. It must preserve for them the illusion, for the time being, that human life makes rather a fine show, and is an interesting, exciting spectacle—amusing or pathetic, as the case may be—but never really vulgar or hideous to excess. In a word, they do not wish, in reading a novel, to go "behind the scenes." Yet, in their own careers,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their own histories—their personal gossip about public men, acquaintances, and even friends—are they not constantly going there? Why, then, do they object to doing so in fiction?

Their objection to going behind the scenes of a theatre is based, partly, in addition to the fear of losing their illusion, upon the current belief that there is a more than average tendency to immorality among actors. Without discussing the correctness of that belief, we may remark that the dread of going behind the scenes of life, in a novel, seems to rest *not* upon a belief, but upon positive knowledge, that much immorality will be found there. It is said that to explore and discuss this immorality is contaminating; that it has the same effect as actual association with low or criminal people. On grounds of public policy, it is better not to make these things public; the influence of such explorations or discussions on children and young people will be bad, and therefore they should be condemned, etc. But is the influence, in truth, any more damaging than that of sermons from the pulpit treating of the same subjects, but in a manner so vague, pallid and remote as to be, for all practical purposes, ineffectual. The arguments against open representation, and, consequently, debate of immorality, rest upon the assumption that the less a bad thing is talked about, the more likely it is to be cured or eradicated. But we know that in fact this is not true. Political corruptionists, for example, would like to have us believe it, and so leave their practices undisturbed in the dark. But publicity is essential to reform. So, too, gambling and drunkenness are freely discussed, and the latter vice may be depicted as vividly as you please in novels, without exciting remonstrance. Only sexual passion, it seems, must not be considered in its erratic, abnormal or injurious phases, although this passion is the most potent of all in the world, is at the very basis of life, and, when it degenerates into vice or lawlessness, is the most dangerous, the most destructive force to which character and happiness can be exposed. Why should this chief element in the problem of human existence and society alone be ignored?

Because, say the advocates of arbitrary restriction, it is immodest to talk or write about it. Twenty years ago, the subject of house-drainage could not with propriety be discussed among people of refinement in this country. The progress of sanitary science made its discussion a necessity. And, finding that it was wiser to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

talk of these things than ignorantly to die from dirt and foul gases, intelligent people of refinement learned that there was no immodesty in openly considering improved drains, traps, and "flushing" systems. The greater part of our rural population is still so falsely delicate that, in this respect, it lives in a condition of uncleanness worse than that of savages; and Southerners apparently prefer to perish of yellow fever, and attribute their death to a "germ," rather than to speak of the cause as filth and remove the same.

Now, as to the delicacy of discussing the morals involved in questions of sexual passion, how did the censors of fiction obtain their ideas respecting modesty and immodesty? Was it not by observation, or experience, or instruction? They were all, at one time, innocent and ignorant young people. Have the observation, experience, or instruction by which they gained their knowledge corrupted them? Not necessarily. They would be the first to deny it. Why, then, must other young people necessarily be corrupted in gaining such knowledge partly from novels?

One thing is very curious. Men and women will go and sit together at a play, where subjects and complications are represented which they would not ordinarily converse about together, and no harm is either done or suspected. This is permissible, because the drama is—by original nature and intention, at least—a work of art, having an improving aim, and must, therefore, be allowed a freedom which, if habitual in the conversation of the two sexes, would doubtless lead to blunted sensibilities and eventual indelicacy. But the same men and women will take violent exception to the same situations, themes and modes of treatment, when met with in a novel, which they tolerated or even approved in the play. Indignant men and women also diligently read novels which have been proclaimed as improper, and then freely compare notes about them, discuss them, and join in condemning them.

The point presents itself: If such books are immodest, is it not immodest for the sexes to talk them over in this way? The censors who do it should in justice be estopped from blaming the authors. Modesty and decency are, at best, relative. The association of men and women in bathing costume on the sea-beach may be entirely harmless, but would be clearly indecent, accord-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing to our ideas, in a drawing-room. Yet in a ball-room ladies may expose a considerable part of their persons without contravening polite custom; whereas if men were to denude themselves to the same extent, in the same place, the ladies would fly from the room with their modesty shocked.

I contend, too, that those ladies who, at the seashore calmly criticise the shortness of other ladies' bathing-skirts, and make no scruple of doing so in the presence of their male friends, are guilty of an immodesty from which the sensible action of the other women, who use short skirts for bathing, is quite free. The common gossip, also, of even good society is, in its suggestiveness, its pruriency, its lingering over unsavory topics, more against decency and good morals than most of the really indecent, or any of the falsely called indecent, novels ever published.

There is a Law of Silence in the code of good and pure manners, founded on a strong instinct in human nature, which forbids too much reference to certain things. The same law must obtain to some extent in art. The one difficulty is to determine how far it shall be applied, and in what manner. We may safely say that when an author dwells persistently on the grosser elements of human nature or sexual passion, without fine, justifying moral or artistic purpose; or appears to gloat over diseased passion; or lingers morbidly upon unclean details; he has passed the bounds of propriety common to both art and manners, and is a subject for more or less reproof. Zola, Ouida and George Moore do this. Alphonse Daudet has been guilty of it in "Sappho," Théophile Gautier in "Mlle. De Maupin," and so have many others. But our amateur censors, with their rickety, uncertain and inconsistent standards of false modesty, are not qualified to apply the test at all. Either the Bible, to them, must be a corrupting book, or else they are hopelessly inconsistent if they defend it as being fit to read. This false modesty results from a mistaken method of bringing up children—especially girls—and is far more dangerous and insidious than a frank and healthy-minded contemplation of even dubious literature, for the reason that it rests upon hypocrisy, error and deceit.

GEORGE PARSONS LATHROP.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MISREPRESENTATION IN CONGRESS.

It has been cynically said that the first and most darling ambition of the budding statesman is to introduce a bill changing the constitution. But the ridicule, as thus expressed, should not debar a careful consideration of its necessities.

At the present moment the House is in a deadlock. While I sit in my seat I notice how one man is able to block the legislation of the whole country, and a singular reflection crosses my mind as to whether our national government is not less representative than we sometimes imagine it to be. For instance, is it not an absolute denial of the rights of the people, what is occurring now? Here is a large majority of the house desirous of expressing their views in one form or another upon the Oklahoma and the Union Pacific Funding bills,—measures affecting countless numbers of people and vast interests—and yet one man holds them in check, obstructing also all other kinds of legislation for the transaction of which three hundred and twenty-four other members were sent here.

Last session again thirty members retarded action for eight days on the Direct Tax Bill. Thus, by the perfectly legitimate use of the rules the popular will can be overridden. Now, this difficulty can be met by a change of these rules, but there is another matter, to the consideration of which it directly leads up, and which is far more important, namely, whether the House of Representatives can itself be justly considered a strictly representative body.

At the present moment nearly half of its members will not sit in the Fifty-first Congress, yet here they are, only prevented by the deadlock from passing laws for the country, while those who have been chosen in their stead have to wait *thirteen* months before they can voice the changed sentiments that have elected them.

Suppose, to take an imaginary case, New York City, in response to some crying need of reform, had returned eight new

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

members representing that necessity? Suppose that necessity were a burning one, a starving question, so to speak; why, before the popular demand could make itself heard, the constituencies would have had time to die of starvation about a hundred times, for the day when the new members would naturally take their seats would be thirteen months later on. Between the time of their election and that of taking their seats, too, would intervene the second session of the old Congress, which we are now in, where the eight old members would yet be sitting, representing antagonistic principles, and therefore, if sincere, naturally prone to render nugatory and retard measures that might come up touching the issues on which they had been defeated. Thus the eight old conservative members would be voting conservatively in spite of their constituencies crying for reform, and nine months' delay after their retirement would elapse before the new members met.

To obviate this nine months' delay, you say the President can call an extra session. But suppose the popular view, as expressed by the vote, is not in harmony with his political creed or leaning. Take President Cleveland's case, and cast his message on the tariff back to a time contemporaneous with the Forty-ninth Congress instead of the Fiftieth, is it likely that he would have called an extra session of a Congress that would meet only to repudiate that policy? Indeed, the truer man he is, the more convinced of the righteousness of his cause, the less likely would he be to order its death knell. Therefore the extra session is not always a safeguard, and can only be so when the new Congress comes in and is in harmony with a new administration.

Again is it logical to expect the same attention and interest in the second session of their terms on the part of Congressmen who have thus been superseded? Is it not in human nature for them to experience a feeling of soreness—of bitterness, or at least a lack of interest? Yet here they sit making laws, or if they desire, blocking legislation; this last not alone by voting against any particular measure, but possibly in a spirit of silent indifference by simply abstaining from voting.

When A's name is called and he, a defeated candidate, votes aye or no, what is the meaning of that vote? Logically he ought to vote against his convictions, for it is supposedly because of his convictions that he has not been returned. His vote, therefore, from a representative standpoint if strictly analyzed, is a falsity,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for it represents nothing but his individual opinion, and if it is given contrary to his convictions it is worse. Every such vote might easily become a nail in the coffin of popular institutions. And even now a democrat records a democratic vote on measures when his constituency has gone republican, and vice versa. To consider such men as representative is a contradiction of terms—a Chinese kind of representation, for they only represent views that have been exploded.

Now, that the smoke and dust of the last election has subsided, it is well to consider this matter, or frankly to confess that our reason for continuing the system is that in our hearts we dread the voice of the people and have no objection to throwing an impediment in their way whenever we can do so surreptitiously.

Again, the importance of the short session, as it is called, must not be measured by its brevity. In the pressure of the long session many of the most important bills are matured and then for lack of time only come up for action in the second. Yet these bills must be voted on by repudiated members. Besides, many important bills that have passed both Houses towards the close of the long session, are not, for the same lack of time, signed by the President. If ten days elapse without his signature they become laws with one proviso, viz., that Congress does not adjourn in the meantime. In that event they not only lose their place on the calendar, but are null and void *ab initio*, and have to be re-enacted.

Thus we see that the rules of the House enable its deliberations to be impeded by one man, and further that in its composition being only strictly representative during one session out of two, this House is but a semi-popular body.

Now, of the many measures introduced with a view to meet the last difficulty, the joint resolution of Mr. Crain, of Texas, is one. This would have Congress assemble each year on the first Monday in January.

I copy from the report of the Select Committee having the subject in charge:

The primary object sought to be accomplished by the ratification of this amendment is to change the time fixed for the commencement and termination of the official term of members of the House of Representatives. The necessity for such change is obvious from a consideration of the evils which flow from our present system of representation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The House chosen in November does not begin its work for thirteen months after its election, although its members draw their salaries from the 4th of March next succeeding. For nine months there is no Speaker of the House; before its members have served their full term their successors are chosen; the certain determination of the second session at 12, meridian, on the 4th of March often prevents the passage of important measures, either from lack of time, as in the case of the deficiency bill at the second session of the Forty-ninth Congress, or because the President has not had an oportunity to examine them, as happened with the river and harbor bill at the close of the same session. The efficiency of Representatives during the short session is sometimes impaired because they have failed of re-election; Representatives are chosen upon issues which may have been settled when they came to the Capitol to enter actively upon the performance of their duties; the people in many instances are not represented by the men whom they have to represent them, but defeated candidates hold over, and the month of December in the first session is practically wasted by the House on account of the holiday adjournments.

"Should the proposed amendment be adopted the members of the House elected in November would have about sixty days in which to receive their certificates of election, to prepare for contests, to arrange their private affairs in contemplation of a protracted absence from home, and to reach the capital. There would be no holiday adjournments; the House would only be about eight days without a Speaker, instead of nine months, as under the present system; the theory of the founders of the Constitution, that the Representatives should come 'fresh from the people,' would be carried out, and they would be engaged in the settlement of the issues upon which they were chosen within sixty days after their election.'

Whether this resolution would best accomplish the object sought I will not undertake to say, but the necessity of making the House of Representatives purely representative and capable of acting in immediate response to the wishes of the people, is manifest, particularly if we consider that there are certain anomalies in the other branches of our government that render it too easy already to check the popular will.

First in importance comes the Senate. It has a representation of two members from each State, irrespective of population. Delaware, Rhode Island or Nevada can therefore block the aspirations of New York, Pennsylvania or Ohio, with their teeming millions.

Thus can be repressed by the Upper House whatever element of popularity there may be in the Lower. Further, the Senators from any particular State do not always represent the complexion of the predominant party in that State, for at this very moment New York has elected by a large majority a Democratic Governor, while its two Senators are Republican. Nor was this case different at the last Presidential election, for when in addition to a Democratic Governor, New York elected also a Democratic President, two Republican Senators still represented her in their capacities to obstruct her will. Nor has she had a single Democratic Senator, despite her many Democratic administrations, since Senator Francis Kernan's time.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now the Senate was modeled after the English House of Peers, or, more accurately, the Senate was intended to take the place of that body; but while the House of Peers cannot originate supply bills, and is kept strictly to that rule, the Senate, on the other hand, can, as a report of the House Judiciary Committee in the Forty-sixth Congress distinctly states in these words:

"The power to originate bills appropriating money from the United States Treasury is not exclusive in the House of Representatives."

Further, the Senate, under the guise of amendments, can completely change the character of revenue bills coming from the lower House—for instance, the Tariff act of 1883 and the present Senate bill on the same subject.

You must remember, too, that a Senate is a greater power than a body handicapped by such a name as a House of Lords. The English upper House is on sufferance and only dares to mutilate, never, at least recently, to destroy. Besides there is no limit to the number of peers; the House of Peers is therefore elastic, which the Senate is not. Thus if the Peers venture to override the popular will, the Prime Minister, representing the popular will in the directest and most immediate manner that a man can represent it, for he is fresh from the people, can simply, by a purely constitutional use of his prerogative, cause to be created a sufficient number of new peers to give assent to his policy, as Peel threatened to do when the reform of the Corn Law was endangered, and carried that measure by his threat alone.

Thus the House of Peers is capable of expansion and can be swamped, while the Senate can never be swamped, and can only be increased by the admission of new states, which when this is done instead of weakening its power only augments it. Besides it is much easier to direct the popular will against a class of hereditary legislators, than against others only enjoying fixed terms. This is the Peers' weakness and the strength of the Nation. Make the peerage for life and its strength is augmented a hundred fold, for you increase its prestige by the introduction of a higher grade of talent on the one hand, and rob it on the other of its most unworthy members.

Is it possible to conceive that any house composed as is the present House of Lords could have ventured to reject Garfield's census bill or to arrogate to itself the power justly belonging

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the Executive and the lower branch as the Senate did in the tenure of office act? It would have been swept away in a tide of popular indignation that would have left nothing behind to mark its remains. Thus the Senate is stronger in two respects: in being non-elastic, it has nothing to fear from an unlimited increase of members, and can, therefore, never be coerced into approval of any measure it disapproves; and, further, representing "sovereignty," "statehood," the Senate is beyond and outside the people. Again, the House of Peers represents aristocracy, which is on the wane, the tendency of a Senate is to represent plutocracy, which is on the rise; not as is often thought so much in the persons merely of wealthy men, but, what is far more dangerous, if it is true, in the representation which powerful corporations and monopolies are said to possess there. Under these circumstances, to have the lower house only representative during one session out of two, to have it placed at a distance of thirteen months from the people, further to have its rules admit of one man controlling its legislation, is fraught with danger; and if you adduce any inference from the fact "that things have worked well" without a change, the inference is that "things have worked well" because the will of the people is not represented in the quickest and most effective manner. You fail to notice also that the reason "things have worked well" is because no real strain on our institutions, fortunately, yet has come. The nearest approach were the circumstances that led to the Electoral Commission, for the war was not a strain on our *institutions*, it was only a strain on our *union*. The government set up by the South was similar to our own in machinery, and had the confederacy succeeded we should simply have beheld two commonwealths of the same distinctive character running side by side—in the one case tolerating the slavery of the negro, in the other tolerating the slavery of the masses, if we can call that slavery, which represses the popular voice by a delusion and keeps the masses in check by delay.

No, the real strain is what Napoleon called the stomach question, and you must recognize the value in keeping "things going well," of the popular belief that every man, never mind how humble his condition, has the seeds of a fortune in his pocket, just as the wonderful successes of the French troops in the revolutionary wars were principally due to the belief that every private

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

carried the Marshal's baton in his knapsack. We have been in the condition of Barnum's happy family, and things have gone on serenely because our stomachs have generally been full. Change that belief of future well-being to the full realization that he is lucky who by the most heroic efforts can escape starvation, or at best can hope to secure a bare subsistence, then will come the real strain, and the tension ought not to be intensified by the failure of the people to make their wants heard in advance. Another reason that representation in Congress ought to be actual and immediate is the fact that the President, who is armed with the power of veto, does not necessarily represent the will of the majority every four years. For though Hayes in 1876 received of the popular vote 220,935 votes less than Tilden, Hayes became President, and when Cleveland in 1888 received a majority of about 92,000 over Harrison, he was defeated.

Now, the system of electoral colleges may serve as an advisable check, but it is not popular sovereignty, and makes the necessity for popular sovereignty in the House all the more marked.

For these several reasons generally you find none of the burning questions represented in Congress. The labor questions, the temperance question, the single tax question, the socialistic question have no representation in the proper place, where by arguments the bad that is in them could be shown and held up to ridicule, and the good that is in them could abide. In short, it is principally in local matters that the voice of the people can express itself immediately, viz., in the choice of their roadmasters, supervisors, aldermen, and State legislators. Whether the popular will is deviated from its proper channel, as is often claimed, in legislatures by lobbying, in boards of aldermen by boodle combinations, in boards of supervisors by "fence rail" politicians, I will not undertake to touch on here, as I am dealing with purely national affairs.

I may be permitted, however, parenthetically, to observe that there is distinguishable in the locations of the several State capitals an evident desire to keep the seats of government far away from the people. Albany, for instance, was chosen as the State capital of New York, not New York City; Annapolis, not Baltimore; Harrisburg, not Philadelphia; Columbia, not Charleston, and continuing the same policy later down we find Lansing instead of Detroit; Columbus again, and neither Cincinnati or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cleveland; Springfield, not Chicago; Jefferson City, not St. Louis.

In short, the seats of government have been located just in those places where the public disapproval would have the most difficulty in reaching, that is, in small hamlets, so to speak, instead of where the great heart of each community beats. And to come back to national affairs after our slight digression, the selection of Washington itself as a seat of our general government precludes the active and ever present espionage of a dense population.

Again, it must not be forgotton that the cabinet, to which we now come in order, is by no means a vehicle for giving expression to the popular will. As a rule how is a cabinet made up? Of those that have borne the brunt and heat of the battle? Is it the Holmans, the Randalls, the Coxs, the Mills? Will it be in the next the Reeds, the Burrows, the Butterworths, the Boutelles, the McKinleys; in short, men whese long and tried service proves the appreciation in which they are held by the public? On the contrary, the cabinet officers when drawn at all from Congress come from the Senate, from the non-representative body instead of the quasi-representative body. And those that are not drawn from there are selected for considerations having nothing to do with any national policy, often because of political cabals or mere personal friendship alone.

In the present cabinet there is not a single member drawn directly from the so-called popular branch, nor can I remember such an instance for the past thirty years.

Now, while it is the fashion to consider a cabinet officer's position principally clerical, his advice controls the line of policy pursued by the particular department over which he presides, so that when directed by an "unrepresentative" officer, that particular policy may neither be in harmony with the wishes or the interests of the majority of the people.

And though the present cabinet supplies all that the most ardent patriotism could desire, there is no assurance of an equally "representative" one in succeeding administrations, whether Republican or Democratic.

Thus, to sum up, and show how the popular wishes of the nation may be deflected, diluted, and destroyed before action can be reached on them, let us take the machinery of government in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an imaginary administration, and let us place it in a funnel or pyramidal shape—

PRESIDENT.
Elected by 100,000 votes less than half the votes cast. Armed with power of veto.

CABINET.
One selected (because *defeated* for Presidential nomination. Two selected from Senate (unrepresentative body). (In present cabinet there are three.) [Two] selected because of cabals. One selected because of personal friendship. One selected because of large contribution to campaign fund.

SENATE.
A non-representative body accused of monopolistic tendencies; of a grasping nature, as proved by their insistence on the power of confirmations over a steadily increasing number of officers, *i. e.*, the Inter-State and other Commissioners; of an encroaching nature, as was shown by the Tenure of Office act, and of a disposition to override the wishes of the people, as evinced by their rejection of the Garfield census bill and the House bills for the forfeiture of unearned land grants.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.
Only representative one session out of two; at a distance of thirteen months from the people, and again governed by rules so unfairly protective of the minority that its entire course of legislation can be blocked by "A FILIBUSTER."

Reverse the position of my pyramid so that it becomes a funnel, can you not see that by the time the popular wishes filter through its many layers of sieves, with a big man at the little end

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

armed with a veto, called the President, and any little man at the big end, called a Filibuster, who desires to prevent consideration of them, these wishes of the people pan out precious thin?

How else can you explain the fact that with all the loud advocacy we hear in Congress of the rights of labor, and we hear enough of it, Heaven knows, not a single vital bill touching the rights of labor has emerged from the funnel end, and become a law, out of the 15,000 bills introduced in this present Congress, and the many "Labor days" it has had.

But you say that the development of the country proves that no change in our system of representation is necessary. This is equivalent to saying that because a boy has grown there is no need to let out his trousers. Can't you see that while a pair of trousers may have answered the requirements of a youth at twelve they may hardly do for the man at twenty-one, and if he grows, he grows in spite of his breeches, as I have often heard boys will? We are growing out of our breeches now, and at a rapid rate. Questions that the framers of our Constitution never could have dreamed of are agitating the community. Questions between employer and employé, questions of transportation, questions of outrageous rings, and startling election frauds. The struggle for mere existence is becoming keener, and with the development of the country circumstances are rapidly approximating themselves to those of European countries. Thus the besotted tendency to consider all that is, is right, can never meet the issue. We are approaching the stomach question, and the members of our Happy Family are growing restive. Restive as they see springing up around them, for instance, a class of private fortunes that no European country under monarchical institutions can show the like of, and alongside of which a poverty that is growing apace. Poverty, that in its despair naturally turns to communism, single-tax-ism and other kinds of isms for relief, and that the "turtle fed" can alone deny the existence of. Poverty, that according to the report of Mr. Ford, the chairman of the Congressional Committee on Immigration, costs the Empire State twenty millions yearly to support. Not only poverty indigenous to the land, but poverty that is dumped upon our shores, lowering the value of native labor by flooding the market, lowering the standard of the workman's scale of living and making less endurable the conditions of those that toil. Can any one say the action of senates in refusing to forfeit un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

earned land grants, of legislatures in giving to individuals exclusive privileges, of emigration commissioners in failing to enforce the laws against pauper immigration, is not in some wise responsible for these disparities of wealth, and can any sane man deny that the complexities of our representation, its elaborations and its delays are the muddy waters in which corruption thrives? All these several circumstances are working to produce changes in our conditions, and yet our breeches remain the same. It was not till the eve of the French Revolution that the necessity of calling together the Etats Generaux was dreamed of. Then it was too late. The breeches had burst, had been discarded, and the nation was "sans culottes." No, our conditions have changed, and because representation is neither direct nor immediate in the lower house, because whatever savors of representation in that lower house is checked in the upper, and further can be hampered by the veto of a possibly unpopular President, or of an accidental one, as Tyler or Johnson, the trousers may burst. Certainly that safety-valve, the facility to secure wealth, is becoming for all except the wealthy, less operative day by day. Huge combinations, the natural outcome of the industrial system, but nevertheless harsh, crowd out the smaller men, and make the road more difficult for him who commences with a slender capital. The present tendency is toward concentration, toward changing the individual proprietor into an employé. A Standard Oil Company, a Sugar or Coal Trust, or an A. T. Stewart, absorbs countless numbers of people who before would have been, instead of subordinate officers, their own masters and their own arbiters of the conditions of the market. Thus the boy is changing, but the breeches remain the same, remain the same when sixty odd millions of people owe allegiance to the Eagle, against four millions when the breeches were made.

Indeed, our conditions have changed with a rapidity far more startling than could have occurred anywhere else, and yet free representation has rather retrograded. What, then, shall we do? —sweep away the Senate? Hamstring the President? No; you fail to see my point. Confined to its proper limits, the Senate fills a necessary part in our machinery of government, and elected by a popular vote, a Presidency is the grandest "institution" on earth.

Nor will I say that the time has yet come to abolish elec-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

toral colleges; but this I do insist on, that you give us a House of Representatives that is truly representative, and in your anxiety to protect the *few* that you respect the *many*. Thus shall there be a safe outlet for the changes I have touched upon before they are demanded by the starving, and thus, and thus only, shall we escape the imputation of keeping "the word of promise to the ear" while breaking "it to the hope."

LLOYD S. BRYCE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NAVAL WARS OF THE FUTURE.

[*Concluded.*]

THE French have been but little behind their island neighbors in building armored ships and making heavy guns, while their classification of vessels has been almost as erratic. Should a British and a French fleet engage each other, it would require a good deal of consideration to dispose them in such a manner that their fighting power would have the greatest effect. Some authorities consider that the French navy is built and armed in better proportion than the British, but that can only be determined by actual experience.

For its size, the Italian navy is perhaps the best arranged of any in Europe. It first class armor-clads, the "Duilio," "Italia," "Lepanto," "Dandolo," "Ruggiero de Lauria" and "Andrea Doria," are marvels of construction and exceed in size the vessels of other navies. These may be truly called ships-of-the-line, and the only objection to them is that they are too large for prompt handling, and it is like carrying too many eggs in one basket; the fighting power had better be in a smaller and more compact form.

Russia has a navy which stands third in numbers and effectiveness, and is modeled after those of Great Britain and France. It is supposed to be equal to the defense of the Baltic, backed by the forts at Cronstadt. All the other European powers have small navies which would help swell the aggregate if Europe should become involved in war. Of these the fleet of Germany is the most important. Either of these navies, supplemented by torpedo boats, would be formidable.

The commanders-in-chief of opposing fleets about to engage in battle could hardly help feeling anxious, for now would come a practical trial of new devices, from the seventeen-inch gun to the mitrailleuse, which latter may sometimes be a most important weapon and again entirely useless. Of all the torpedoes that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been devised, the Whitehead is generally considered the best, but, although thousands of these weapons have been purchased by the powers of the world, their use in future wars is doubtful. The experiments made by the British Government prove that the auto-mobile torpedo can be disposed of by steel nets hung about a ship's hull, and they are so easily deflected from their course that they cannot be sent against an enemy with any certainty. In its present stage of development the torpedo can hardly be considered a very dangerous weapon—it has not proved itself so in wars of the past.

Here, then, is an element of warfare of which professional men predicted the most important results, which will have to give way to something better, viz.: the American torpedo, now under advisement, which will probably make a great change in future naval operations.

Then there is the ram, with which most of the sea fights of the ancient Greeks were won. All foreign navies have vessels fitted as rams, which are expected to perform great service in time of war. The "ram" is simply an elongation of the bow under water, and although no doubt a vessel so fitted would inflict great injury on an enemy by running into her, she would be liable to injure herself quite as much, and go to the bottom with her foe. No modern rams have been tried in war, and ships so constructed will most likely be failures. In proof of this, take the case of the armor-clad frigate "König Wilhelm," of the German navy, which, in 1878, by bad management, struck the "Grosser Kurfurst" in the side and under water. The latter ship was sunk, and the former so damaged that she had great difficulty in getting into port. The sinking of the British armor-clad "Vanguard" by the "Iron Duke" is another case in point. Thus another element must be eliminated from the calculations of those who have depended on "König Wilhelms" to ram the enemy's ships in time of battle. And so it will be in many cases with the untried weapons with which we must go to war, and the result will be surprise and disappointment.

Such ideas do not seem to have troubled European naval architects, nor to have influenced those on this side of the Atlantic who are attempting to follow in their footsteps, and who generally adopt what Great Britain and France have long since discarded.

I have endeavored, as briefly as possible, to state the general

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

condition of European navies, and will now suppose a case when war has actually occurred.

The navies of Great Britain and France are nearer equal than any other two nations, and while the former has exerted great energy and skill in pushing her navy ahead, France has not been behind hand. Though all French armor-clads cannot be considered in the light of ships-of-the-line, they will be useful in battle from the heavy guns they carry.

In the battle of Mobile Bay, it will be remembered that the small monitors with heavy guns surrounded the huge "Tennessee," and almost smothered her with their rapid fire. As I have before remarked, it may not be well to put too many eggs in one basket; or, in other words, not to have too great confidence in very large ships. Two ships of our "Puritan" class, costing, for both, two millions of dollars, are better than one of the "Agincourt" or "Minotaur" class, which would cost about the same amount.

Let us assume that, in the year 1894, war has been declared between Great Britain and France, and the dock-yards and arsenals of both are busy with preparations for the conflict. To listen to the remarks of the populace one would not suppose that for more than three-quarters of a century the two countries had gone hand in hand in the march of civilization, and had barred the way of the Russian bear to the plains of Constantinople. France is preparing to carry out the policy of the great Napoleon, by the invasion of England, a more feasible undertaking than when sailing vessels had to be depended on to carry troops and munitions of war. At Havre a camp of eighty thousand soldiers is forming; at Calais, fifty thousand men are encamped, ready to be transported to Dover, whence they will march upon London; forty thousand more troops are at Dieppe, ready to land near Yarmouth, while another select corps of equal size is to be landed at such point as occasion may require. For the transportation of all these troops great numbers of sailing transports are provided which are to be towed by the steamers. Scows are provided for the purpose of landing horses and artillery and pontoon bridges to cross any river in England. Nothing is left undone to make the invasion a success—the "Invincible Armada" could not compare with it.

To carry all these troops and their horses and artillery, and tow the transports, are one hundred and thirty-five steamers of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Messageries Maritimes and other commercial companies, and three hundred and thirty-three others, in all four hundred and sixty-eight steamers of seven hundred and forty-five thousand six hundred and sixty tons displacement. A part of this flotilla is sufficient to transport the two hundred and ten thousand troops to be embarked for the first landing, while the rest of the steamers and sailing vessels are to be kept in reserve for reinforcements. The steam mercantile marine of France, although not comparable to that of Great Britain, is a powerful adjunct in time of war. To insure the support of their whole naval force the French government has directed the ships at Toulon to assemble at Cherbourg and Brest.

These preparations for the invasion of England are based on the supposition that the French armored fleet is superior to that of Great Britain, the French, forgetting that British journalists are great grumblers who cry down their own navy in time of peace, have been misled by such representations instead of being guided by their own observations. They seem also to have forgotten in the lapse of years the numerous victories the English have gained over them upon the sea. The Frenchmen argue, "We are now on a par with our old enemy; this is a military movement, ships and troops being managed by military tactics—the French will beat the English at that kind of fighting where science counts for more than brute force."

Let us assume that all the arrangements are made for a French invasion of England, while English travelers look on with dismay at the prospect of being kept for years out of Paris, and all England is in a panic, for the English are always frightened when the invasion of their country is threatened, and have been so since the time of William of Normandy. They forget when the project is mentioned what British hearts and hands have done in the past to protect their island, and do not think of what they can do in the future with the weapons now at their disposal. The preparations for invasion are known in London as soon as they are fairly under way in France, and while the people tremble at the danger impending, the military and naval authorities devote all their energies to meet the coming storm.

The regular troops, enrolled volunteers and militia, are ordered into immediate service, and stationed at points on the coast where an invading army will be likely to land. These forces number

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

four hundred and fifty thousand men, the larger portion of whom are stationed between Yarmouth and Portsmouth, and an especially large body at Dover, where it is expected the French will attempt to disembark and march upon London. The Channel Squadron occupies the English Channel as far as the Straits of Dover, and has been reinforced by twenty-five frigates, thirty sloops and twenty swift dispatch vessels. Some of the latter are employed constantly in running past the French ports to ascertain the force of vessels, and to note any changes that may occur.

Frigates, sloops and dispatch vessels are stationed all the way from Land's End along the West coast of Ireland, so that a complete system of communication is kept up from Cape Clear to Yarmouth by vessels as well as by inland telegraph and cable. The declaration of war against England by France is much regretted by most of the States of Europe, for it is generally considered that the difficulties could have been settled by arbitration, and now after some years of peace the world is about to witness the result of that science which has been so liberally applied to navies since the time when the "Monitor" and "Merrimac" gave the world to understand that the day of wooden ships was over.

The contending naval forces to form the lines of battle are as follows:

ENGLAND.

Turret Ships.

8 Inflexible, 4 16-in., 4 4-in.	4 Thunderer, 2 12-in., 2 12½-in.
4 Dreadnaught, 4 12½-in.	9 Colossus, 4 12-in. (B. L.), 5 6-in.
4 Devastation, 4 12-in.	9 Edinburgh, 4 12-in., 5 6-in.

Barbette Ships.

10 Collingwood, 4 12-in., 6 6-in.	10 Camperdown, 4 13½-in., 6 6-in.
10 Rodney, 4 13½-in., 6 6-in.	12 Benbow, 2 17-in., 10 6-in.
10 Howe, 4 13½-in., 6 6-in.	10 Anson, 4 13½-in., 6 6-in.

Second Class.

Turret Ships.

6 Agamemnon, 4 12½-in., 2 6-in.	4 Rupert, 2 9.2-in., 2 6-in,
6 Ajax, 4 12½-in., 2 6-in.	2 Hotspur, 2 12-in.
6 Conqueror, 2 12-in., 4 6-in.	2 Glatton, 2 12-in.
6 Hero, 2 12-in., 4 6-in.	

Corvettes.

4 Belleisle, 4 12-in.	4 Orion, 4 12-in.

Third Class.

Rigged Ships.

12 Superb, 8 10-in., 4 9-in.	9 Shannon, 2 10-in., 7 9-in.
6 Neptune (turret), 4 12½-in., 2 9-in.	15 Bellerophon, 10 9-in., 5 7-in.
7 Monarch (turret), 4 12-in., 2 9-in., 1 7-in.	11 Penelope, 8 8-in., 3 40-pdrs.
14 Hercules, 8 10-in., 2 9-in., 4 7-in.	10 Imperieuse (Bar), 4 9.2-in., 6 6-in.
19 Sultan, 8 9.2-in., 4 8-in., 7 4-in.	10 Warspite, 4 9.2-in., 6 6-in.
12 Alexandra, 10 10-in., 2 11-in.	18 Audacious, 10 9-in., 8 4-in.
8 Temeraire, 4 11-in., 4 10-in.	14 Iron Duke, 10 9-in., 4 64-pdrs.
12 Nelson, 4 10-in., 8 9-in.	14 Invincible, 10 9-in., 4 64-pdrs.
12 Northampton, 4 10-in., 8 9-in.	18 Swiftsure, 10 9-in., 8 4-in.
	18 Triumph, 10 9-in., 8 4-in.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fourth Class.

Turret Ships.

4 Cyclops, 4 10-in.
4 Gorgon, 4 10-in.
4 Hecate, 4 10-in.
4 Hydra, 4 10-in.
4 Prince Albert, 4 9-in.
4 Scorpion, 4 9-in.
4 Wyvern, 4 9-in.

Gun-boats.

4 Viper, 2 7-in., 2 24-pdrs.
4 Vixen, 2 7-in., 2 24-pdrs.
4 Waterwitch, 2 7-in., 2 24-pdrs.

Fifth Class.

Rigged Ships.

32 Warrior, 4 8-in., 28 4-in.
32 Black Prince, 4 8-in., 24 7-in.
16 Achilles, 14 9-in., 2 7-in.
17 Minotaur, 17 9-in.
17 Agincourt, 17 9-in.
26 Northumberland, 6 9-in., 18 8-in., 2 6-in.
18 Hector, 2 8-in., 16 7-in.
18 Valiant, 2 8-in., 16 7-in.
16 Defence, 2 8-in., 14 7-in.
16 Resistance, 2 8-in., 14 7-in.
18 Lord Warden, 14 8-in., 2 9-in., 2 7-in.
12 Repulse, 12 8-in.

FRANCE.

Cuirassés, 1st rang.

14 Devastation, 4 13½-in., 4 10⅝-in., 6 5½-in.
14 Foudroyant, 4 13½-in., 4 10⅝-in., 6 5½-in.
18 Amiral Duperré, 4 13½-in., 14 5½-in.
6 Caiman, 2 16½-in., 4 4-in.
6 Indomptable, 2 16½-in., 4 4-in.
6 Tonnerre, 2 10⅝-in., 4 4¾-in.
6 Fulminante, 2 10⅝-in., 4 4-in.
2 Furieux, 2 13½-in.
14 Redoutable, 8 10⅝-in., 6 5½-in.
16 Trident, 8 10⅝-in., 2 9½-in., 6 5½-in.
16 Friedland, 8 10⅝-in., 8 5½-in.
16 Colbert, 8 10⅝-in., 2 9½-in., 6 5½-in.
15 Marengo, 4 10⅝-in., 4 9½-in., 7 5½-in.
11 Océan, 4 10⅝-in., 4 9½-in., 2 5½ in., 1 4¾-in.
15 Suffren, 4 10⅝-in., 4 9½-in., 6 5½-in., 1 4¾-in.
13 Flandre, 8 9½-in., 5 7½-in.
12 Gauloise, 8 9½-in., 4 7½-in.
19 Richelieu, 6 10⅝-in., 5 9½-in., 7 5½-in., 1 4¾-in.
13 Heroine, 8 9½-in., 3 7½-in., 2 5½-in.
16 Provence, 8 9½-in., 3 7½-in., 2 5½-in., 3 4¾-in.
16 Revanche, 8 9½-in., 3 7½-in., 2 5½-in., 3 4¾-in.
15 Savoie, 8 9½-in., 3 7½-in., 4 5½-in.
16 Surveillante, 8 9½-in., 4 7½-in., 4 5½-in.
16 Valeureuse, 8 9½-in., 1 7½-in., 6 6.3-in., 1 4¾-in.
12 Couronne, 8 9½-in., 4 7½-in.
15 Formidable, 3 17-in., 12 5½-in.
6 Terrible, 2 16½-in., 4 4-in.
6 Requin, 2 16½-in., 4 4-in.
15 Amiral Baudin, 3 16½-in., 12 5½-in.
24 Hoche, 2 13½-in., 2 10⅝-in., 20 5½-in.
24 Magenta, 2 13½-in., 2 10⅝-in., 20 5½-in.
24 Marceau, 2 13½-in., 2 10⅝-in., 20 5½-in.
24 Neptune, 2 13½-in., 2 10⅝-in., 20 5½-in.
6 Charles Martel, 4 13.4-in., 2 10⅝-in.
20 Brennus, 4 13.4-in., 8 9½-in., 8 5½-in.

Cuirassés, 2d rang.

2 Tempête, 2 10⅝-in.
2 Vengeur, 2 13½-in.
2 Tonnant, 2 13½-in.
12 La Galissonnière, 6 9½-in., 6 3⅝-in.
14 Triumphante, 6 9½-in., 1 7½-in., 6 5½-in., 1 4¾-in.
13 Victorieuse, 6 9½-in., 1 7½-in., 6 5½-in.
10 Alma, 6 7½-in., 4 4¾-in.
12 Atlante, 6 7½-in., 6 4¾-in.
12 Belliqueuse, 4 7½-in., 4 6.3-in., 4 5½-in.
10 Jeanne d'Arc, 6 7½-in., 4 4⅝-in.
12 Montcalm, 6 7½-in., 6 3⅝-in.
12 Reine Blanche, 6 7½-in., 6 4-in.
12 Thétis, 6 7½-in., 6 3⅝-in.
12 Bayard, 4 9½-in., 2 7½-in., 6 5½-in.
12 Dugueselin, 4 9½-in., 1 7½-in., 6 5½-in., 1 4¾-in.
10 Turenne, 4 9½-in., 2 7½-in., 4 5½-in.
12 Vauban, 4 9½-in., 1 7½-in., 6 5½-in., 1 4¾-in.
12 Acheron, Cocyte, Phlegeton and Styx, building, to be armed with 1 10¾-in. and 2 4-in. guns each.
4 Fussée, Grenade, Mitraille and Flamme, building, to be armed with 1 9½-in. gun each.

Garde-cotes Cuirassés.

2 Cerbére, 2 9½-in.
2 Tigre, 2 9½-in.
2 Bélier, 2 9½-in.
2 Boule-dogue, 2 9½-in.
1 Tareau, 1 9½-in.

Totals.

England..... 647 guns.
France..... 683 guns.

To the British fleet is added a reserve of forty frigates, twenty sloops of war and thirty dispatch vessels, the latter of great speed. Fifteen of the largest and swiftest merchant steamships armed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with smooth bore and each carrying two eight-inch guns, and forty large steamers carrying coal and munitions of war. Attached to the British fleet are eight large troop-ships of the "Crocodile" class, to be used for a particular purpose in the battle between the contending squadrons. This is a large force requiring great ability to direct.

On October 20th the English fleet puts to sea reporting to the Commander-in-Chief of the Channel Squadron, and are assigned to stations under twelve rear admirals. It now remains to be seen whether the French or the English build the best ships, or whether the ships of either are suitable for war purposes, which have the best guns and which the best system of tactics.

The British Admiral forms his fleet in line of battle off Portsmouth and cruises between that point and Dover, when his look-out vessels report the French fleet standing out of Brest and Cherbourg, accompanied by thirty frigates, twenty dispatch vessels and a number of torpedo boats of different sizes. Three cheers go up from the British fleet and the signal is given, "Form in open order in line ahead!" while the dispatch vessels are ordered to observe night and day and report events in the Straits of Dover.

At this moment the strength of the opposing forces is as follows: British, 62 battle ships, 647 guns; French, 59 battle ships, 683 guns, the British outnumbering their enemy by three ships, while the number of guns and weight of metal are on the side of the French.

The transports carrying the French troops have not yet left harbor, and it is intended they shall do so only when victory is assured the French fleet, then they are to sally out and land at some fixed point in the British Islands, unknown to any one except the French naval authorities.

The night of October 20th is an anxious one; few in either fleet close their eyes. For many years no great battle has been fought upon the ocean, and this one will decide whether all the naval powers have made vital mistakes, or which has evolved the best system out of the various problems that have been offered for solution, and is therefore to remain the principal naval power.

The 21st of October is ushered in with pleasant weather and a moderate breeze from the north, which is not sufficient to cause

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the ships to roll more than six degrees. At daylight the French fleet is seen standing toward the British fleet in four lines, distant twelve miles, and making a speed of ten knots. The British Admiral signals: "Prepare to form line of battle; head to the northward in groups of three." The fleet is then lying in order line ahead, and when the signal of execution is hoisted the ships close up in groups of three line abreast, a cable's length apart.

At this moment there are coming from the direction of Portsmouth eight vessels low in the water, with apparently no guns, and running at a speed of twenty knots an hour. Close behind them follow twelve dispatch vessels with platforms projecting over their sterns. The British Admiral has taken his station on board a fast dispatch steamer fitted with masts for signaling. He is accompanied by twelve swift tugs to carry orders through the fleet, for a rule has been adopted that the Commander-in-Chief of a fleet shall observe his command from a vessel not in line of battle in order more easily to direct the movements.

When the French ships are within a distance of four miles signal is made to the twelve small steamers (with platforms on the stern) to form in line ahead between the French and English. At this moment the French Admiral makes signal, "Form in column of twos, speed eight knots." Thus while the English, contrary to custom, await the French attack, the latter stand on as if intending to penetrate the English centre. Neither fleet has what may properly be called *rams*,—both trust to the underwater "snout" which caused the sinking of the "Grosser Kurfurst" and the disabling of the "König Wilhelm." The French remember how Lord Rodney "broke the line" of the French fleet in 1782 and captured the best part of it, and perhaps will try this grand manœuvre upon the English, or at all events bring their antagonists to close quarters, when superiority in guns will give them great advantage.

When the French are within three miles, the small steamers with platforms are signaled to "proceed," and they steer rapidly towards the French, and the French Admiral signals, "Lower the torpedo nets." When within a mile of the French fleet, the steamers turn suddenly and run in a zig-zag course towards the British fleet, at the same time commencing to lay a net made of strong ratlin-stuff, with wire rope at the top and supported by cork buoys painted the color of the water. The French not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

understanding this manœuvre open on the vessels with four-inch Hotchkiss guns. As soon as the net layers have performed their task and got out of the way, the British open upon the advancing enemy all along the line, and in the confusion on board the French ships, owing to the damage inflicted by the shots, they hardly notice the nets, and continue their course, firing rapidly and enveloped in smoke.

The leading French ships soon find their propellers fouled by the nets and their speed decreasing, the ships in the rear crowd on those ahead and in shearing to avoid collision also foul their propellers. The six headmost ships are thrown into confusion, and signal is made to those astern, "Slow down, obstructions ahead." Now is the time for the English to act. Signal is made from the Admiral's vessel, "Right and left wings close upon the enemy, centre divisions stand fast." With a graceful movement the two wings close in upon the van and centre of the French fleet and rounding-to side by side with the Frenchmen there ensues such a combat as the world never before witnessed.

As the two fleets close with each other the French torpedo boats emerge from both sides of the line, and when within one hundred and fifty yards of the English send their torpedoes rapidly out, but the former have their steel nets down and it is like firing peas at an iceberg. Then the English open on the torpedo boats with their four-pounder Hotchkiss and thirty-six-pounder rapid firing guns, four of the torpedo boats are blown up, others are disabled and the remainder retreat to their ships. The English have refrained from encumbering themselves with this weapon of war, which many costly experiments have demonstrated to be useless. They know that auto-mobile torpedoes cannot pass through their steel nets and are satisfied that their own weapons of the same kind cannot pass through the French nets, so have left them behind in the dockyard.

The French van is now in confusion, the centre is enveloped by the wings of the British fleet and the rear is out of action. The French Admiral makes signal to his rear to advance in single column on the starboard and port side of the English fleet and open their batteries, which is done in good order. At the same moment the English centre forming in two columns line ahead bears down upon the French, the starboard column attacking the rear on the port side, the port column attacking the confused van.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Simultaneously the eight peculiar long, low vessels start off with a speed of twenty-six knots, rasping alongside the outer French ships. An explosion takes place and a huge column of water rises high in air—a French ship staggers under the blow, her crew rush for the boats, in five minutes she has disappeared beneath the water. The next torpedo vessel touches the "Trident." The shock is not so great, but the ship hauls out of action and is attacked by three British frigates of the reserve, which keep up such a cannonade that the Frenchmen cannot stay at their guns, being mowed down by the rapid firing guns of the English. In half an hour the "Trident" surrenders.

By this time the French are maintaining a heavy fire on the torpedo vessels with their six-inch rifles and secondary batteries, but they are proof against that weight of metal and pass on to the iron-clads of the second class, four of which are shattered by their torpedo blows and haul out of action in a sinking condition.*

In time of battle mistakes are liable to occur, and a torpedo vessel, curiously called "Cleveland," in honor of the distinguished man in whose Presidency this class of vessels was first designed, strikes the barbette ship "Collingwood" under the counter, causing her to haul out of action leaking so much that the pumps can hardly keep her afloat. One of the French Admirals remarks: "How stupid of the Englishmen to be hoisted by their own petard."

I here take the opportunity to say that the torpedo boat mentioned is a purely American invention, made to grapple with an enemy's ship and blow a hole in her bottom. This torpedo is fitted with an adjustable bar worked by steam, which is swung under the bottom, moving away nets and other obstructions while going at a speed of twenty knots an hour. The discomfiture of the French ships shows with what effect this vessel operates.

An hour after the two fleets join battle there is a blaze all along the line. Scarcely a breath of wind is blowing, and the smoke hangs in thick clouds over the combatants, obscuring everything. The gunners can only fire at the flash, and cannot tell whether their shots hit the enemy. Who can tell what is going on behind that wall of fire and smoke? What chance is there for tactical manœuvres? It seems to a looker on as if the result will be "the

*In an hour the "Alma," "Belliqueuse," "Jeanne d'Arc" and "Montcalm" are at the bottom.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

survival of the fittest." Blow after blow falls with the weight of Thor's hammer, yet after four hours of steady fighting neither side seems to be materially injured. The English torpedo boats can no longer operate for fear of injuring their own ships. They remain outside the line awaiting their opportunity. The French torpedo boats have long ago given up the idea of sinking anything, and retire behind the line of frigates, where the Admiral watches anxiously the result of the engagement.

After the fourth hour the "Rodney" emerges from the smoke lashed to the French ship "Formidable," which with her three seventeen-inch guns has made sad havoc with the "Rodney's" hull. A seventeen-inch shell penetrates her machinery and destroys her motive power. The captain of the "Formidable" considering the "Rodney" as good as captured tows her outside the line where the fight continues and the rapid firing thirty-six-pounders and Hotchkiss guns are brought into play. There is no science displayed—nothing but the brute courage of the combatants. The seventeen-inch guns of the "Formidable" are too much for the thirteen and a half-inch guns of the "Rodney," but the Briton bears his punishment bravely.

The line of battle is now extended a length of four miles; those in the rear have little idea of what is going on in the van or centre. Signals cannot be seen, as the atmosphere is everywhere dense with smoke, though the firing is not so incessant as in the beginning. At the end of the fifth hour two tremendous explosions fairly shake the ocean, and the firing on both sides suddenly ceases, it is the silence of calm after a great storm. The smoke clearing gradually away reveals the hulls of the contending ships struggling to release themselves from the debris of battle.

Three British and three French ships lashed to each other recommence hostilities as soon as they can ascertain their position. Those ships still in the smoke do not fire, as they do not know what to fire at. The British Admiral sends out a tug to ascertain the cause of the explosions, and six other tugs to direct the commanders of divisions to get their ships clear of the smoke, and form a new line of battle. At this moment the line of battle is badly disarranged; no one has seen its shape for three hours.

On their return the tugs report that the explosions are from the "Nelson" and "Marengo" blowing up while lashed together, and that several ships on either side are badly damaged. The British

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Admiral wonders if he will not lose all his best ships before the battle is over, and anathematizes the man who invented steamships and iron-clads, sighing for the good old days of Rodney and Nelson.

In another half hour the British ships begin to struggle into line to the northward, keeping between their enemy and the coast of France so as to cut off retreat. Oh, what a battered line of battle! The British Admiral is in despair. "My God!" he exclaims, "this will be considered a French victory." The only firing at present is that between the six ships that had paired off, the "Alexandra" with the "Richelieu," the "Iron Duke" with the "Foudroyant," and the "Temeraire" with the "Friedland."

When the French Admiral examines the British ships as they fall into line, "*Mon Dieu!*" he exclaims, "but we have beaten them; we will land in England and the Nile, and Trafalgar will be avenged!" Then, as his own ships come out from the cloud of smoke, "Malheur! I miss six of my ships, and four more are entangled in a net. We shall be fortunate if we return safely to France. Make signal to form in line of battle; we will try steam tactics, this brute force is disgraceful!"

No fleets like these can fight for five hours at close quarters without being considerably damaged, and, suffice it to say, the battle is not renewed. The fleets retire to a respectful distance from each other, including the six belligerents, who have kept up the contest the longest.

Now reports come thick and fast from the chiefs of divisions to the respective commanders-in-chief, and what sad accounts of things there are. "We must land our troops in England," say the Frenchmen, "or lose every vessel!" "Work all night," say the Englishmen, "we will not make so many mistakes to-morrow, we are learning wisdom, these are not the ships with which Nelson fought. The French guns are too much for us; why have not the Admiralty built proper rams, for those are the largest kind of projectiles?"

The reports from both fleets of bursted guns, broken gun-carriages, breech-bolts blown out, boats smashed, turrets jammed, bulwarks broken, spars demolished—beggar description, they can only be appreciated by the profession, yet the death list on either side is not great, and few of the ships are disabled in their machinery. Curved steel decks have, in many instances, deflected

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the huge shells and saved vessels from destruction, and both British and French officers are satisfied that in the adoption of this device they have made no mistake, and that to make an armor-clad invulnerable below the water-line it will be necessary to thicken the curved deck so that magazines and machinery will be out of danger, and a ship with all her guns disabled may still have a chance of escaping. Nothing can destroy her but a properly constructed torpedo boat, and this has made its appearance on the 21st of October, 1894, and has disabled every vessel with which it has come in contact.

The night is spent by the belligerents in repairing damages, especially to the great gun-carriages, which seem to have carried away most of the fastenings, so that the commanding officers of many of the ships may well exclaim, "I have no heavy guns left." Up to and including the six-inch rifles, the gun-carriages stand well, but from that point up, it is generally admitted, the carriages are too weak for the guns. The conclusion arrived at by the officers in either fleet is that the present armor-clads cannot stand the blows of the sixteen and one-half and seventeen-inch rifles any better than wooden ships stood the battering of the forty-two-pounder and eight-inch shell guns, but they are in for it and must fight with the weapons supplied to them.

Here, in the first great battle of recent times, all the lessons taught in the schools of technology are thrown overboard, tactical science ignored and two fleets have entered into a combat in which, like untrained soldiers, they have clubbed each other, with the result that both parties are badly damaged, although both owe it to themselves to keep their vessels in compact form, not to let them foul with their opponents and to decide the contest by methods more worthy well trained scientific officers.

The night after the battle the British and French fleets are lying eight miles apart, repairing damages. The three British forge ships, large steamers fitted with all the appliances of the machine shop, go from ship to ship, to put the gun carriages and machinery in serviceable condition. In this work are engaged over four hundred mechanics, so that by eight o'clock on the morning of the 22d a great deal of the damage had been repaired. No attempt is made to efface the marks of the heavy blows given by the French seventeen-inch shot and shell, which do not much interfere with the fighting qualities of the ships.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But what a sad spectacle to see this mighty fleet, the pride and shield of Britain, so battered and torn!

It is not encouraging to those who have put so much faith in steel hulls, proving to their own satisfaction that the great rifle gun is *king*, and that in action it is only a matter of time when the hull must give way before its crushing and penetrating blows. The French, as badly shattered as the British, are meanwhile doing their best to repair damages, in no wise dispirited by the many fissures in what they had considered their impenetrable ships. It has not often happened to them to lie undisturbed so near a British fleet. It is evident that the new system of warfare places nations nearer an equality.

The night after the battle two large steamers, which have eluded the vigilance of the British lookout ships, join the French fleet. These steamers bring with them forty eight-inch rifled guns prepared for firing melanite shells, together with a large quantity of ammunition. These guns are provided with the latest improved carriages, with steel shields and circles for the guns to work upon. Two hundred expert workmen accompany the guns to put them in place. The two transports run alongside the ships of war, transferring to them their ordnance and stores. This accession causes great rejoicing among the Frenchmen, who now are confident of victory when the attack is renewed, and the French Admiral determines to adopt a system of tactics to confuse the British and enable the French gunners to crush their ships at long range with melanite shells.

The French have been a good deal demoralized by the attacks of the British torpedo vessels, which have inflicted serious loss on their fleet, but as the attacks are not repeated, the French conclude that all the damage has been done, and that the torpedo vessels have been defeated in their plans. The true reason, however, for the torpedo vessels not continuing their attacks is that the British have laid their ships on the outside of the rear of the French, and the torpedo vessels cannot get at the enemy without putting themselves between the fire of the heavy guns of both parties. Both parties are glad to rest from battle, and so they work away repairing damages until eight o'clock of the following morning.

At about that time it is reported to the British Admiral that a fleet of twelve armor-clads are coming through the Straits of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dover. Later it is reported that the strange squadron is standing towards the French fleet and passing through their line. Later it is reported that the strangers are Germans, and are standing towards the British fleet. This is a great relief to the Admiral, who has run up the signal for battle and for his reserves to close up and cover the fleet.

The German Admiral passes with his squadron all along the line of battle where he sees the battered armor-clads, and cannot repress his astonishment that vessels built with so much strength and at such vast expense should have received so much damage in so short a time. "Ah!" he exclaims, "the gun is king; now we will fire from our Krupp a one thousand eight hundred pound shot capable of penetrating twenty-six inches of steel. Worse than this, Krupp now makes a gun of one hundred and fifty tons, with a shell weighing a ton and a half, having an initial velocity of one thousand nine hundred feet per second, giving a striking force of fifty-seven thousand nine hundred and thirteen foot-tons! What is to become of future fleets?"

The German Admiral steers for the British flagship, runs up the English flag at the fore, and fires a salute of fifteen guns, then he goes on board the British ship.

"Ah! My good Admiral," exclaims the German, "you have fought a great battle, but cannot land your fish, neither can the fish escape. Prince Bismarck sends his compliments together with these vessels. You cannot afford to risk another battle, with the chance of being crippled, for the French will then land where they choose in England. They have still a reserve of fifteen armor-clads fitting out in Cherbourg; you have none. Since the encounter the French have received forty melanite guns."

"Yes," replies the British Admiral, "but I have my eight torpedo vessels, and have already sunk six of their ships and can sink all the rest when once I meet them again in line."

"But the melanite guns will destroy your torpedo boats and then the French will land. Take my advice, let the Frenchmen go into Brest or Cherbourg. They will not be able to get out again for months. You can beat them at repairing, sending in one-third of your vessels at a time."

This is, perhaps, good counsel, but the British Admiral cannot be induced to follow it; he must capture that fleet or perish in the attempt!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Ah!" continues the German officer, "the true policy is not to get a fleet battered to pieces if you can prevent your enemy from attaining his object when he is in all respects your equal if not your superior. You will accomplish what you aim at, and that is a tactical victory. To invite a battle and, perhaps, defeat, will endanger your island, you cannot afford to risk that."

The German Admiral takes his leave and it seems as if his arguments have more effect on the French Commander-in-Chief, who on the approach of night gets his ships under way and returns to Cherbourg. The British lookout ships follow, but the armor-clads are obliged to remain behind. One of the American-built torpedo vessels evertakes the rear of the French fleet, and running alongside the "Flandre," one of the largest ships, brings her ponderous bar with a hundred-pound gun-cotton torpedo under the enemy's bottom, and in five minutes the "Flandre" is at the bottom of the Channel.

This is the end of hostilities for the time being between the fleets of Great Britain and France, for both parties must repair damages before undertaking further operations. The French are not satisfied that they can successfully operate at sea in face of the British torpedo vessels, and the reserve of fifteen armor-clads is not considered sufficient to enable the fleet to undertake the landing of troops in England under existing circumstances. This engagement between great armor-clads shows that war vessels in 1894 are yet far from perfection.

Our impression of what the future line-of-battle ship should be, will perhaps seem extravagant to those who have been engaged in devising war vessels. The best way, perhaps, to test the question would be to put one of the strongest armored vessels under fire of two seventeen-inch guns for half an hour. The experiment would be worth all it would cost, for it might save many battles in the future.

The commerce-destroyers of to-day are well adapted to their purpose, and in case of war between two maritime nations, the commerce of both would probably be swept from the ocean.

No ship has yet been constructed that would serve the purpose of a *ram*,—that is, could run with great speed into an enemy's vessel and sink her without material damage to herself, or could receive the heaviest shell without being crippled. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fleet that has the swiftest ships, other things being equal, will probably win, for such ships can always choose their position at sea.

The torpedo of the last decade has shown itself to be practically useless. The American torpedo vessel now under advisement, will, no doubt, become a powerful adjunct in time of war, as steel nets will afford no protection against them.

The object of a navy is for the protection of coasts and to make war on an enemy; unless it is equal to both these requirements it is defective. The great gun is the prime factor in war, for it will command not only an enemy's coast but all his seaboard cities. Last, though not least, fleets will be twice as formidable through a perfect system of drill, so that the most complicated manœuvres can be executed on the water the same as by a well drilled army on land. One or two fleets will be sacrificed owing to defects in the system of Naval Tactics, but the time will come when tactics will be perfected and the manœuvring of a fleet will be "a thing of beauty."

Skill in handling large numbers of vessels, in gunnery and managing torpedo vessels, will be essential to excellence in future fleets. In this will be included the use in battle of nets constructed for the purpose of impeding the progress of ships in line, as elsewhere mentioned in this article.

The first step towards the rehabilitation of all the naval powers will be the introduction of a class of vessels of the line that shall be practically unsinkable by shot or shell, and at the same time carry a good supply of the heaviest guns. The gun vessel is the most important in war, for it combines more than any other class, and these ships should be built to possess the greatest speed and endurance, and offer a uniform resistance all along the line of battle, as did the ships of the British navy in the days of old.

Iron has usurped the place of the oaken walls, but as yet it does not appear that the iron ships are *proportionally* as effective considering the change in material of hulls and the greater size of ordnance, as were the ships of the Wellington class.

In the naval wars of the future the United States will not probably play a conspicuous part. This country seems to possess none of that fitness for naval power of which her early history gave promise. The United States government waited twenty years after the close of the civil war before commencing to rehabilitate the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

navy, on the plea that it was desirable to see what the powers of Europe were going to do, apparently not remembering that the best steam and sailing vessels in the world were the results of American genius in the days when it took the initiative. Americans have abdicated the position which their vast resources entitle them to hold, and have not had the energy to keep their mercantile marine from being driven from the ocean by foreigners, who, as common carriers, take on an average one hundred and fifty millions of dollars out of the country yearly in payment of freights.

Our coasts and seaboard cities are unprotected, and our navy is a by-word even among the Chinese, who, since our Civil War, have seen nothing better than the "Richmond," the "Brooklyn," and such like vessels of the past which are unfit to be sent abroad, yet we could, if we would, soon be equal to the best of European navies in line-of-battle ships and heavy guns, since, as I maintain, there is not one perfect line-of-battle ship in any navy.

As yet the only fair test of the endurance of modern armored ships is the engagement between the fleet under command of Admiral Seymour and the defenses of Alexandria. On that occasion the following British ships took part: Outside squadron, "Alexandra," "Inflexible," "Sultan," "Superb" and "Temeraire."

"Alexandra," 9,480 tons displacement; main deck battery, eight ten-inch rifles; spar deck battery, two twelve-inch, two ten-inch rifles; total, twelve guns.

"Inflexible," 11,880 tons displacement, two sixteen-inch rifles in each turret; total, four guns.

"Sultan," 9,290 tons displacement; in casemate battery, eight ten-inch rifles; in upper deck casemate, four nine-inch rifles; total, twelve guns.

"Superb," 9,170 tons displacement; in casemate, main deck, twelve ten-inch rifles; in bow and stern batteries, four ten-inch rifles; total, sixteen guns.

"Temeraire," 8,547 tons displacement; in casemate, four ten-inch, two eleven-inch rifles; in turrets, two twenty-five-ton guns; total, eight guns.

Inshore squadron: "Invincible" (flagship), "Monarch" and "Penelope."

"Invincible," 6,000 tons displacement; casemate, main deck, six nine-inch rifles; spar deck battery, four nine-inch, four sixty-four-pounder rifles; total, fourteen guns.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Monarch," 8,320 tons displacement; in turrets, four twelve-inch rifles; in bow, two nine-inch rifles; in stern, one seven-inch rifle; total, seven guns.

"Penelope," 4,470 tons displacement, eight eight-inch rifles, three forty-pounders; total, seven guns.

Five wooden gunboats, composite built: "Bittern," "Condor," "Beacon," "Cygnet," and "Decoy."

"Bittern," 1 7-inch, 2 40-pounders; total, 3 guns.

"Condor," 1 7-inch, 2 64-pounders; total, 3 guns.

"Beacon," 2 64-pounders, 2 20-pounders; total, 4 guns.

"Cygnet," 2 64-pounders, 2 20-pounders; total, 4 guns.

"Decoy," 2 64-pounders, 2 20-pounders; total, 4 guns.

Guns in outside squadron	52
Guns in inshore squadron	28
Guns in gunboats	18
Grand total	98

I think every naval officer will admit that had the old wooden line-of-battle ships of the Trafalgar and Wellington class taken the place of the armor-clads at Alexandria, they would have silenced the forts in an hour with little damage to themselves. The British vessels were not seriously injured, but the perforations of the Egyptian shells showed what trouble would have occurred had they been charged with dynamite. Here is a new element that has not been used in battle, but there is little doubt from experiments made in this country with the Graydon shell against iron turrets, that a new aspect will be given to future wars by the use of this powerful explosive. The value of the Graydon shell has been demonstrated by experiments that should satisfy the most skeptical. Some trials of this projectile conducted by officers of the U. S. Army, show its destructive effects against iron. Perhaps two or three small vessels, each armed with one long-range dynamite shell gun, will soon be able to destroy the largest armor-clad of the present day.

The following is the account of the experiments: "The gun used on this occasion was a seven-inch Ames wrought-iron, muzzle-loading rifle, weighing twenty-three thousand pounds, and the weight of the charge of powder was twenty-three pounds. The projectile was of steel, open at the rear and closed by a bronze

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plug, the same general form as used in the service; its weight being one hundred and twenty-two pounds and the charge of dynamite exploded being two and two-thirds pounds." . . .

"The first shell struck the target twenty-four inches above the horizontal joint and thirty-three inches to the left of the embrasnre, and, although it was a glancing shot and not a "point on" shot, as was desired to test the penetration, it made an indenture three inches deep, exploding with great violence." . . .

"The roof (of the turret) was lifted off, breaking seven bolts, each one and three-fourths inches in diameter, used to assemble the same, and five bolts three and three-fourths inches in diameter, used to bolt the front and rear plates together. It also made a crack ten inches long in the front plate and about eighteen inches long in the rear plate."

"The wreckage was very marked, in fact, almost complete, the roof alluded to above, which weighed thirty thousand nine hundred pounds, being torn off and blown twenty-five feet to the rear by actual measurement."

"The two seven-inch plates of the turret proper were also torn apart a distance of five inches, breaking off the bolt heads which secured the plates together."

In regard to the Zalinski pneumatic gun I am not prepared to give an opinion, as it has not yet been tried under the difficult circumstances that will attend its use on shipboard. Its insufficient range is calculated to weaken confidence in the invention, but if it does succeed there will be another factor which, although not equal to the Graydon dynamite projectile, will still make its mark in the naval wars of the future.

It may posssibly be that Americans, who at present are so far in the rear in regard to naval matters, will ere long come to the fore with inventions which will give them the superiority, and they may be prepared in a *cheap way* to inflict on an enemy so much damage that it would not be worth while for any one to meddle with us.

The naval wars of the future will most likely be carried on among European powers. The United States will have but a small share in them, since the latter will not be willing to maintain a navy sufficient even to protect their coasts and seaboard cities. They will prefer to do as they did once with the Barbary Powers, pay tribute! Future naval battles will be something to appall the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stoutest hearts. Civilization will stand aghast at the awful spectacle, the bottom of the ocean will be strewn with wrecks, mammoth guns and the bodies of men, commerce destroyers will carry ruin and desolation in their wake. The horrible implements of destruction have so multiplied that the results we have indicated cannot be avoided. The only consolation is that the next great war may be so terrible that future conflicts will be less likely to occur, and the world will therefore remain at peace.

DAVID D. PORTER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE AMERICAN BOY.

In the freedom and expansion of American life there is a tendency to excess, which appears everywhere; in American humor, in American enterprise and speculation, and, to sum up, in the American boy. He can hardly be called a new species; his faults and merits are those of the young Caucasian everywhere; but in him they exhibit an ebullition which, as in some liquors, may be developed by a little more than ordinary warmth and movement, or by a removal of pressure.

A lack of moral pressure, in the way of judicious discipline, is often the cause of Young America's most conspicuous and most exasperating foibles. Perhaps more than any other boy in the world, he is allowed to grow up, doing about as he pleases. Among the wealthier classes, this laxity of family government may be the result of the father's immersion in business, and of the mother's devotion to what is called Society; or it may come from their excessive parental pride: in their eyes the smart child can do no wrong. His impertinence is laughed at, and the perversity that should be brought to terms by firm measures, is soothed with sweetmeats, coaxed with candies. This faulty training exists quite as much among our hard-working people, with whom it often takes a different form through the tired mother's fretfulness and discouragement, or from the changing moods of the father. If the parents are cross, the boy keeps a wary eye to windward, expecting squalls, and knowing that his lightest misconduct will be visited by heavy retribution. If they are good-natured, he is bold in his disobedience. Here is an authentic instance of a Western farmer's method of enforcing parental authority:

It is Sunday evening; he is smoking his pipe on the back porch, while young Josh, his namesake and heir, is playing with the dog in the yard. Old Josh takes his pipe out of his mouth and remarks that it is time for young Josh to go for the cows.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The junior makes no reply, but keeps on teaching Congo to give his paw. Then the senior repeats his observation, to which he manages to give a little more the tone of a command.

"I tell ye, Josh, ye must go for the cows!"

"I do' wanter!" grumbles young Josh.

"Quit yer foolin', an' go along!" says old Josh.

"I shan't," snarls back the junior.

"I tell ye to go!" exclaims the elder.

"I tell ye I won't," mutters the boy.

"Wal, never mind," says the father; "mebby they'll come home."

But even in families where good sense and gentle firmness govern the house, the boy may yield to vicious propensities in himself, or to bad influences from without, and run a course that may well cause his friends to despair of his future. His character seems to contradict all that is known of the laws of heredity, if we contrast it solely with the sober respectability of his parents, and do not look farther back. Whether man has emerged from monkeydom, may be a question. But that civilization has been evolved from savagery, there can be little doubt. And as the race has risen from ruder conditions, so the epitome, the individual, begins with the native wildness of the stock, and develops later whatever sweetness of humanity he may be capable of. The man is an enlightened being, the boy is a barbarian. He inherits not only the mild parental possibilities, but also all the cat-like or tigerish traits which enabled his progenitors, in the dim past, to make the struggle for existence. Sometimes it seems as if his humanity were as thin as his jacket, and fitted him as loosely. The wild animal is underneath; strip him and you will find the stripes. Perhaps even the sedate deacon, his sire, wears a not much more thickly woven garment of moral conformity and polite goodwill.

So I do not quite despair of the worst boy of whose daily doings I have some slight knowledge. He may be a model of good behavior at home, like a sheep-killing cur I once knew that was never observed to cast a carnal eye upon his master's flock, but would even defend it from other dogs, while he joined them in doing slaughter on neighboring premises. Wouldn't his confiding friends (I am speaking of the biped) be amazed if they could see

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a chronicle of his deeds for a single day? In chestnut-time he is up early; in melon-time he is out late. Heedless of the notice, "No trespassing," he helps himself to nuts before the owners are awake, and regales himself on melons after the weary gardener has gone to his virtuous sleep. Broken boughs and a litter of empty burrs tell of his depredations; or he may be tracked by a trail of rinds to the corner fence. There he has sat with his fellows and finished his feast, as a number of scattered rinds bear witness, but beyond that he cannot be traced. It is he who pelts the school-girls with apples in autumn, and with snowballs in winter, generally from behind some wall or hedge. It is he who shouts up the doctor's speaking-tube, and then darts out of sight in the nearest alley. It is he who drives honest John Chinaman wild with his mischief, throwing rubbish into his laundry, and then tripping his heels with rope when he runs out to catch the marauder in the street, which they have darkened by turning off the gas at the lamp post. It was he who helped to get the minister's horse up the stairs and the hayloft, from which he could be got down again only by means of a staging built up to the window on the outside of the stable.

We go to the French language for the label, *enfant terrible;* but the piquant article itself we find nearer home. I believe the American *enfant terrible* can "give points" to any other *enfant terrible* on the face of the globe. He is not only capable of speaking the most disagreeable truths at the most inopportune moments, but he does not hesitate to resort to fiction when it will suit his purpose better. At a seaside hotel, last summer, a young lady wished for her gloves, which she had left in the parlor, but did not like to go for them, because two young gentlemen who had paid her some attention were sitting by the table. So she asked her younger brother to get them. He refused, and she finally went for them herself. The boy followed her; so did the eyes of the young men; when, as she was taking the gloves away the imp of perversity drawled out:—

"I offered to get 'em for her, but she wouldn't let me. I suppose she wanted an excuse to come in where the fellows are."

Though one of the mildest tempered maidens that ever suffered from the malevolent wit of a younger brother, one could see by the sparkle of her eye that, if his neck had been a chicken's, it would then and there have got wrung.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why is it that in the boy of the family so much more naughtiness commonly crops out than shows itself in his sisters? How often do we see mother and daughters making silent, cheerful sacrifices to the headstrong selfishness of the son! His restlessness, his unreasonableness, and, what is worse, his unscrupulousness, are taken as matters of course, and borne with and forgiven. "He is a BOY!" explains everything, as if he belonged to a different order of creature from themselves. The father may be as mildly mannered and as conscientious as the mother, but the boy is nearer barbarism than the girl, for the reason that the fight for existence has fallen chiefly upon the male of the race, and that kindliness is earlier developed in the sex that keeps the home.

It is fortunate when this effervescence of boyish force finds an outlet in useful occupation, or even in innocent sport. Giving a boy a gun, a fishing-rod, a bicycle, or a set of mechanical tools, may save him from so many things. A sail-boat may quench the ardor of his desire for a seafaring life, a camping out in the wilderness may cool his fancy for going to fight the Indians. Only do not let these curative experiences be too costly. A few years ago some youngsters in the suburbs of Boston conceived the not very original idea of going West and becoming cow-boys. Before undertaking the real thing they thought they would have a little practice as amateurs. They would lasso a cow. The leader, the Buffalo Bill of these juveniles, having to act the double part of horse and rider, tied a clothes-line to his own waist, and made a loop of the other end, which he threw over her horns as she was quietly feeding in the pasture. It took her some time to find out what the fooling meant. Then she made things lively for that boy. The part of the lasso-thrower was successful; but the part of the horse was a failure. He was thrown to the earth and dragged; one continuous streak of cow and rope and foolish boy flying across the brambly field, and over walls and fences, to the amazement of spectators, and to the especial profit of nobody but the village surgeons, who were sent for after the rope—along with three ribs—had got broken. A general impression seemed to be left upon the youngsters that there was not so much fun in lassoing a cow as they had expected.

There are undoubtedly better ways than that of letting off a boy's superfluous vitality and giving guidance to his activities. There is probably some sphere of usefulness which the most worth-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

less ne'er-do-weel could fill, and would be happy in filling, if we could only discover it. Few parents understand their own children: it seems that they will never give over trying to force the round pegs into the square holes. The boy with an aptitude for mechanics must be sacrificed to the parental pride, sent to college and pushed into one of the crowded professions; a born naturalist is spoiled to make a poor man of business. The teacher who can discern and draw out the latent genius of his scholars has the rarest gift for his vocation. I remember reading a few years ago, in an educational journal, the experience of a schoolmistress with the most intractable of her pupils. Nobody had ever been able to do anything with him; punishment had no effect; appeals to his pride and ambition, and notes to his mother, were equally unavailing. So she set herself to watching him; perhaps by patient observation the key to his character might be obtained. One day she saw him catch a fly; and for the next fifteen minutes he was absorbed in a minute examination of the insect, his usually dull and listless countenance lighted up with the keenest interest. There was certainly one avenue to his intelligence she determined to test it.

"Boys," she took occasion to say, not long after, "what can you tell me about flies?" She called upon the brightest members of his class and found that they could tell very little. Then came the turn of the dullard. For the first time in his life his enthusiasm was kindled by something going on in school. He forgot his indifference, and became eloquent, giving a brief description of the wings, feet, eyes, head and habits of the fly, to the astonishment of teacher and pupils. Talking with him afterwards she learned that it was his fondness for the woods and fields and of the study of insects and birds that distracted his attention from his books, and distressed his mother with the belief that he was wasting his time. His new teacher took a different view of the case, put books of natural history into his hands, and led him by degrees to see the necessity of preparing himself for his favorite pursuit by learning something of grammar, geography and mathematics. So the dunce of the school became one of the best scholars, and in later years eminent.

The prevailing modes of teaching have not always been the best that could be devised for educating, that is, drawing out the latent energies of the young. How many capable graduates we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have known who have passed from the academy or the college to find that all their book-learning has left them unfitted for the first step in the business of life! Crammed with unassimilated knowledge, they have not been taught to *think;* there is nothing that they can *do.* Industrial and practical art training, which is now assuming an important place in our educational system, promises to be of the very greatest use in developing and molding such minds.

The effect upon a boy, especially if he has been what we call a "bad boy," of turning his energies in the right channel, can sometimes be likened only to the supposed miraculous conversion of sinners. His restlessness is curbed. The new purpose shines in his countenance and beams from his eye. All his views of life are suddenly changed. It is no longer a mere frolic, to be enjoyed in the fleeting hour, at all hazards, but something deep and vast and serious, full of perils, but also full of glorious possibilities. The brier of his wildness puts forth the bud of wisdom; prudence bridles impulse. Happy the son, and happy indeed the parents, when such a transformation takes place. Is not every reckless young spendthrift of golden days capable of such a conversion? All over the land despairing parents are anxiously asking the question: "Cannot the good in our boy be reached? Will he never turn from his wayward course?"

But we must not judge the army by its stragglers and hangers-on. While there is always a ragged edge of the incompetent and the vicious on its borders, the great body of boys in this land, as in any other land, marches steadily forward to an assured future. In these ranks are the statesmen, the judges, the great poets, the great orators that are to be. In this land, as in no other, exist opportunities which may make the lowliest lad of the present the foremost man of the coming time, a truism which it is well enough for both sons and fathers sometimes to reconsider.

I almost repent calling the boy a barbarian, now that I think of some magnanimous boys I have known. What unconscious heroism in common life; what devotion to the humblest duties; what uncomplaining sacrifice and plodding services, for the sake of mother and sisters and home! Small heroes of that sort exist, obscure and unrecognized, all over America to-day.

The most remarkable instance of conscientiousness and generosity in a child which ever came to my knowledge was exhibited,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not by a girl, but by a boy. He was, however, a very youthful specimen; Willie, aged five or six. He had a cake, a portion of which his cousin Minnie coveted. She accordingly reminded him, as she was fond of doing when she had a point to gain, of what "the Bible says" about doing to others as we would be done by. "Now, you know, Willie, if I had the cake you would want half of it." Willie hesitated a moment between inclination and a conviction of duty, then said honestly: "I should want all of it." With tears in his eyes, but resolutely choking down his grief, he handed over to her the entire cake, which she walked off complacently nibbling.

Boys will put upon one another and quarrel among themselves; but let one get into trouble, through no special fault or meanness of his own, and see how generously they will stand by him and combine to help him out. Their efforts on his behalf may not always be wise; I can recall cases in which they were curiously inadequate. In the town where I live there used to be a card factory, at the door of which was a heap of leather shavings. One day half a dozen school-boys might have been observed to gather up handfuls of these trimmings and carry them to a neighboring shed. There, after a sufficient quantity had been accumulated, one of their number, whom we will call Jacob, removed a portion of his clothing and loosened his vest, while his companions plated him all over and stuffed him full of scraps and parings, bound in place by kite strings, and finally buttoned firmly under his trousers and jacket. He was to be the recipient in school that afternoon of a flogging of which his mates did not approve, and this was the coat-of-mail with which they ingeniously provided him. Their intentions were excellent, but the result was not satisfactory. Jacob, on re-entering the school-room, seemed to have grown astonishingly rotund during his dinner hour, and perhaps there was something in his gait (he moved with careful circumspection in the fear of dislocating his armor), which excited the master's suspicions. A preliminary shaking, as he was hauled up for punishment, prepared for the catastrophe, so that when his thrashing began the rain of refuse leather down his trousers-leg, and out of his sleeves and waistbands, was something phenomenal, and long to be remembered. What added weight to his woe was the inconsiderate laughter of his mates, whose mistaken kindness had thus exposed him to a double dose of the birch.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Boys will laugh at such things despite all the dictates of honor and humanity. Excessive mirthfulness is characteristic of the American shaver. But it is a pardonable fault. Not so his lack of reverence, which is perhaps his most notorious and most discreditable failing. When his laughter springs from that, as it so often does, it ceases to be innocent. One often wonders if there is anything in heaven or on earth so sacred that the lawless urchin will not make fun of it. Deference to superiors, respect for parents, veneration for years and wisdom, these are qualities of which he knows little or cares less. It is a radical defect; not simply a source of annoyance to others, but a flaw in his moral constitution. Nor is it confined to the juvenile trifler alone. The spirit of national independence has gone into the boys' heads. If the American youth does not press forward and unlock the golden gate of life, to which art, science, literature, all the shining avenues of enterprise are but the splendid approaches, it will be chiefly for want of

"The master-key of knowledge, reverence."

Other tendencies to excess in our life and manners are especially perilous to the American youngster. The rage of speculation, the hurry to get rich, the passion for display, social excitement and extravagance, cast an early blight upon his purest aspirations. Caught in the furious whirl of fast living, he has little opportunity for the culture of what is most delicate and precious in the heart and mind. The example of successful bad men relaxes his moral sense; he comes to think that obligation is nothing, that duty is an illusion, and life itself a lottery in which audacity and unscrupulousness bear off the prize. When he sees even good citizens, for party purposes, condone the practices of corrupt wire-pullers and political Pecksniffs, how can he continue to believe in the sacredness of pledges, of honor in public and private affairs? It behooves fathers to be honest, sober, prudent in their own conduct, and chary in their choice of teachers and law-makers, if only for the sake of the influence exerted upon their sons.

When Mr. Emerson contrasted the not over-luxurious habits to which his children were brought up with the pinching circumstances of his own childhood, he expressed some misgivings, thinking the cold and bare-floored attic a safer nursery than warmed and carpeted chambers for hardy character and high

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thoughts. But it is not easy to conceive of a mind like Emerson's being rendered effeminate by early conditions of affluence, although they may afford temptation and opportunity to a boy innately vicious. Early days of hardship are sometimes, no doubt, a useful discipline, and every brave boy will make the best of them. But Washington was a born aristocrat, and it is a question whether Lincoln and Garfield might not have been as well fitted for their respective careers if they had had a less severe fight with fortune at the start. Of the young volunteers who flew to arms at the outbreak of our civil war, it was found that those who had been gently nurtured were not only among the bravest in battle, but the most cheerful and uncomplaining amidst the miseries of hospital, bivouac and march. It depends more upon what a boy has in him, than upon his surroundings, whether he will leave life a failure or make it a success.

There was never any better stuff in the world for the shaping of men than there is in the American boy of to-day. Even when wicked he is not often mean in his wickedness; he might be the hero of Plutarch's story of the Lacedæmonian lad, who, having stolen a fox, held it concealed under his cloak while it tore his bowels out rather than have the theft discovered. With all his failings, which are many and manifest, he has courage, gayety, endurance, readiness of wit and potency of will. Give direction to these forces, deepen his conscience and elevate his point of view, and the future of the American boy, the future of America itself, is secure.

J. T. TROWBRIDGE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SHALL WE BANISH SILVER COIN?

A ROYAL Commission was "appointed to inquire into the recent changes in the relative values of the precious metals" in September, 1886, and after two years of labor, the Commission—not being able to agree upon all the questions submitted—made a triangular report. Part I. was signed by the twelve Commissioners; Part II. by six of them; and Part III. by the other six. The six who signed Part II. were Lord Herschell, Mr. Fremantle, Sir John Lubbock, Sir I. H. Farrer, Mr. Birch, and Mr. Courtney. Part III. was signed by Sir Louis Mallet, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Chaplin, Sir W. H. Houldsworth, Mr. Barbour, and Mr. Monatgu.

Part I. contains a historical survey of the subjects treated, and a large amount of exceedingly valuable information, admirably arranged, but without recommendations.

Part II. is long and elaborate, abounding in valuable statistics and other useful information, showing an intimate knowledge of the evils arising from the present disturbed relations between gold and silver—frankly admitting the importance of some kind of re-adjustment, and conceding that the trouble *does not arise from the scarcity of gold in relation to silver;* but the report is inconsistent in its parts, fertile in untenable objections, inconsequent in its conclusions, proposing plans of relief quite inadequate to the conditions, wholly impracticable, and absolutely bewildering to any honest seeker after light upon this recondite subject.

From its scope and drift, one might easily imagine that the six Commissioners were all retired Lord Chancellors, intellectually convinced that international bimetallism was the only remedy for the evils under which Great Britain and her Indian Empire now suffer, but dreading lest the introduction of silver might diminish the purchasing power of their gold pensions; and just here we cite from the report.

"Section 128. It must be remembered, too, that this country is largely a creditor country of debts payable in gold, and any change which entailed a rise in the price

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of commodities generally, that is to say, a diminution of the purchasing power of gold, would be to our disadvantage."

Already at Sec. 107 the six Commissioners had said:

"We think that in any conditions fairly to be contemplated in the future, so far as we can forecast them from the experience of the past, a stable ratio might be maintained if the nations we have alluded to were to accept and strictly adhere to bimetallism, at the suggested ratio. We think that if in all these countries gold and silver could be freely coined, and thus become exchangeable against commodities at the fixed ratio, the market value of silver as measured by gold would conform to that ratio, and not vary to any material extent."

And at Section 119 they say:

"* * * We are fully sensible of the benefits which would accrue from the adoption of a common monetary standard by all the commercial nations of the world, and we are quite alive to the advantage of the adoption by these nations of a uniform bimetallic standard as a step in that direction."

But immediately after this sensible admission, terror of some adverse opinion seems to have seized the six Commissioners, and they exclaim:

"The change proposed is tremendous, and we cannot but feel that to a great extent it would be a leap in the dark.

"The public mind certainly is not prepared for it at present, and the very novelty of the proposal would excite apprehensions, which in themselves might not be without their danger.

"We speak of the novelty of the proposal, because, though it has been for some years publicly advocated with great ability and earnestness, it has not found any thing like general acceptance, and those accustomed to the existing system have often been disposed to put it aside as a chimerical proposal, unworthy of serious consideration.

"Under all these circumstances, whilst fully impressed with the difficulties of the present situation, and more especially with those which affect the Government of India, we are not prepared to recommend that this country should proceed to negotiate with other nations a treaty embodying a bimetallic arrangement. We feel that the matter needs much more discussion and consideration in the financial world and by practical men than it has yet received, and that we are not in a position to advise with any confidence that the change could be made safely, or without the risk of creating evils exceeding those which we at present experience."

Then swiftly another dread shadow arises before their minds which they thus describe:

"A further danger to be apprehended is that the nations who were parties to the bimetallic arrangement might not continue to adhere to it.

"It may be difficult to suggest any motives which should make it their interest to secede; and it may be capable of proof that any country violating the international compact would subject itself and its people to loss and serious inconvenience, but unhappily, enlightened self-interest is not the only motive of the political action of nations, nor is self-interest always enlightened. A desire to inflict injury may often exercise as potent an influence as self-interest, and the idea that the financial

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

position of one country might be endangered with a resulting advantage to other countries might well afford a sufficient motive for action."

To us on this side of the Atlantic, it seems a trifle Pharisaic, and not quite courteous to suggest, that the other Christian "nations who were parties to the bimetallic agreement might not continue to adhere to it."

This has a flavor of the earlier days, when England despoiled India and complacently assumed that She was the one nation of commercial honor. If treachery to treaty stipulations is indeed "a danger to be apprehended," then no international treaty, upon any subject, should ever be made.

But after conceding, in strongest expressions, the evils resulting from the fall of silver, and saying much in favor of international bimetallism, they propose a scheme of relief likely to startle the solid men of England.

THIS IS THE SCHEME.

"Section 134. Before passing on to other proposals, there is one which we recommend for adoption without hesitation.

"We refer to the abolition of the duty on silver plate, to which we have drawn attention in Section 173. We do not suggest that it is likely to have any very extensive result, but, so far as it operated, it would be beneficial and a step in the right direction."

But lest, peradventure, this plan should not bring immediate relief from all the evils incident to the fall of silver, they propose the following, which they "*think the best:*"

"Section 137. WE THINK THAT THE BEST SUGGESTION in relief of the tension of the existing situation is to be found in the issue of small notes based on silver. These might become the substitute for the half-sovereign, and if they came into general use they would afford a remedy for those difficulties in relation to that coin, to which public attention has been prominently called.

"Twenty-shilling silver notes might also be issued. If these were put into circulation they would probably pass largely into use, without any alteration of the law of legal tender; and we are inclined to think the mint or bank might safely be required to issue such notes to some fixed amount, in exchange for silver bullion taken at the average market price; or the Government might issue them upon condition of retaining silver capable of being coined into an equal number of shillings. The market thus opened for silver might check the decline in price of the metal, besides producing an economy in the use of gold."

After reading these plans, which they "think the best," and finding that the six Commissioners concede the principles and admit the facts for which bimetallists contend, we are surprised to find them "letting I *dare* not wait upon I *would*," betraying the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

timidity of the politician, instead of the courage of a statesman. The wind-up of Report II. is in these words :

"Section 138. Though unable to recommend the adoption of what is commonly known as bimetallism, we desire it to be understood that we are quite alive to the imperfections of standards of value, which not only fluctuate, but fluctuate independently of each other ; and we do not shut our eyes to the possibility of future arrangements between nations which may reduce these fluctuations. One uniform standard of value for all commercial countries would, no doubt, like uniformity of coinage or of standards of weight and measure, be a great advantage. But we think that any premature and doubtful step might, in addition to its other dangers and inconveniences, prejudice and retard progress to this end."

"We think also that many of the evils and dangers which arise from the present condition of the currencies of different nations have been exaggerated, and that some of the expectations of benefit to be derived from the changes which have been proposed would, if such changes were adopted, be doomed to disappointment.

"Under these circumstances we have felt that the wiser course is to abstain from recommending any fundamental change in a system of currency under which the commerce of Great Britain has attained its present development."

Part III. is brief, consistent and earnest for the establishment of bimetallism by a congress of all the great commercial powers.

In America, we wonder how these "best suggestions" and the wavering and inconsistent views reported in Part II. will strike Mr. Goschen, the eminent Chancellor of the Exchequer; and how they will be received by that class of Indian officials and suffering agriculturists whose continued sufferings—largely consequent upon the fall of silver—constrained the Queen in her address to Parliament a year ago last September to say:

"I deeply grieve to add that there is no mitigation of the suffering under which large portions of the agricultural community continue to labor."

THE FALL OF SILVER.

We have now to consider what has caused the fall of silver, and what influence its exclusion from free coinage has had upon the trade and agriculture of England, India and the United States.

It is related that a plain man called the attention of Sir Isaac Newton to an apparent fact, confronting, one of Sir Isaac's theories; that the great philosopher, having made examination, said, "The theory must give way, there is no arguing against a fact."

I propose to call attention to certain facts of authentic history and to give certain dates bearing upon the causes of the fall of silver, the depression of trade and the fall of prices, and to prove

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the fallacy of certain theories which have deluded so many sensible men on the subject of gold and silver. The fall of silver commenced in 1873, and its tendency has been downward ever since.

The tables of Pixley show that during a period of forty years next prior to 1873 the average price of silver in the London market was about 61 pence per ounce, with but little range of variation during the whole forty years; and that during the short period of thirteen years from February, 1873, to July, 1886, there was a variation of $17\frac{5}{16}$ pence, and that on the 19th of May, 1887, silver fell to $41\frac{5}{8}$ pence.

How happens it that for forty years next prior to 1873 the price of silver was nearly stationary, and that within the short space of thirteen years thereafter it had fallen close upon nineteen pence per ounce?

For a time it was claimed that the cause of the fall was to be found in the superabundant product of silver and the scarcity of gold; but examination of the facts proved that theory to be entirely fallacious. There has been no scarcity of gold, and when, in 1879, the silver dollar was at a premium of 5.22 over the gold dollar, the gold in proportion to silver was greater than ever before known, and during the twenty-five years next following 1850 there was added to the world's stock from the mines 3,317,625,000 dollars of gold and but $1,395,125,000 of silver. Thus, three thousand three hundred and seventeen million six hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars in gold were added—a greater addition than had before been made since Columbus discovered America.*

There is but one enduring CAUSE OF THE FALL OF SILVER, and that is the cessation of the demand for it in the standard coinage of the mints in the Christian world.

On the 23d of November, 1871, after Germany had conquered France, and Bismarck had exacted a thousand million dollars in gold indemnity, he commenced the execution of his scheme of new coinage in Germany, and on the 9th of July, 1873, was ordained by law the national gold standard with the gold mark as the unit of value. Before this the metallic currency of Germany was silver. She then commenced the coinage of gold, called in her silver in exchange at the ratio of 1 : $15\frac{1}{2}$ and threw

* Tables of Soetbeer.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

her silver upon the market. Then Denmark, Norway and Sweden changed their currency to gold and threw their silver also upon the market, and the Netherlands did the same.

Then France, Italy, Belgium, Switzerland, and Greece at first restricted their silver coinage and soon ceased to coin it at all, and what is truly amazing, the great American Republic, producing nearly as much silver as all the world besides, by the Act of February 12, 1873, stopped its coinage entirely, made the gold dollar the sole unit of value, and thus helped to degrade its own great product of precious metal. Every nation in Christendom now has free coinage for gold, and not one of them allows free coinage to silver. Does any one need to look further for the causes which have depreciated silver and appreciated gold?

Every one familiar with financial history knows that for centuries prior to 1873 gold and silver, *both*, have formed the currency of the general commercial world, and *together* measured the value of commodities, and that more than half the money of the world is silver. (Estimated in the Treasury Report of December, 1875, at 54 per cent.)

That from the early development of commerce in England, until 1816, the unit of value was silver, and that the English pound was silver.

That from the foundation of the government of the United States until February 12, 1873, the silver dollar, *of the same weight and fineness as now*, was a unit of value, full legal tender, and that its coinage was free.

That during a period of forty years next prior to the passage of said act of February 12, 1873, the same silver dollar had ruled at a premium over gold.

That until about the date last mentioned, every important government in Christendom, except England, allowed free coinage to silver, and that since that time not one of them has permitted its free coinage, but all have given free coinage to gold.

That from 1873 until 1878, the United States did not allow its mints to coin a single silver dollar.

That England changed the coinage act in 1816, made gold the unit of value and allowed it free coinage, but allowed no legal tender to silver in a greater sum than forty shillings.

That so soon as the Act of Congress of February, 1878, requiring a limited coinage of silver (on government account only) was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

passed, the gold advocates loudly predicted that even this limited coinage of silver would drive all the gold abroad, cheat the laborer of his hire, and bring general disaster upon the country.

That the silver bill of February, 1878, has now been in operation more than ten years, and every one of the gloomy predictions of the gold men have proved to be false.

THEORY THAT SILVER WOULD BANISH GOLD.

The gold theorists, even so late as 1886, insisted that the continued coinage of silver *must* drive out gold; but the coinage went on and the gold increased.

For more than ten years the mint has been stamping the silver dollar, and the result will amaze the the gold men.

Turning to the Mint report of 1887, page 86, we find that at the close of the fiscal year (July 1), 1877, there was but $167,501,472 of gold in the country, and from the tables made up to November 1, 1888, we find at that date **$711,705,050** OF GOLD IN THE COUNTRY.

France ought to have given us some heeded lessons upon that subject. She is a compact country, her territory is less by twenty-seven thousand square miles than the single state of Texas. She has long had between five and six hundred million dollars in legal tender silver, and the gold in the Bank of France has been habitually larger than that of the Bank of England.

On the 9th day of last August the Bank of England held 20,009,615 pounds gold and no legal tender silver, while the Bank of France at the same date held 44,269,764 pounds of gold and 48,940,762 pounds of silver making 93,210,526 pounds of coin, against but 20,009,615 pounds in the Bank of England.

But the gold men had another pet theory, that under the "*Gresham Law*" the gold would surely be driven away by the silver.

Probably not three in a thousand of those who talked with easy flippancy about this law, knew who Gresham was, when or where he lived or what his law was;—had they known, they would have seen, that the Gresham Law had no application to Bank of England notes, American greenbacks or silver dollars, but related only to mutilated coin in the time of Queen Elizabeth.

This accumulated rubbish was disposed of by Lord George

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bentinck and Mr. Thomas Baring, to be found in Parliamentary Debates, Vols. 90 and 95, thus stated:

"The common opinion is that if there is an over-issue of bank notes it will drive the gold out of the country. That was the fundamental position of the famous bullion report in 1811, and it has been the basis of all our subsequent legislation on the subject. But in this case the very reverse took place; for when it was known that notes would be freely issued *hoards* of gold *immediately* made their appearance, and the stock of bullion in the bank instantly began to increase. The notes came out, and, what was directly *contrary to the theory*, the gold came back at the same time."

Theorists upon physics and metaphysics, theology, law, and finance have done infinite mischief in times past; but in this more enlightened age, gaseous theories are exploded at the touch of facts.

When it was found that they could not stop the coinage of the dollar, the gold advocates insisted that the silver would not circulate, that the disgusted people "*would not have it.*"

The President's message, lately issued, states that on the 30th day of November, 1888, 312,570,990 of the silver dollars had been coined, and all but 14,181,654 were in actual circulation, $60,970,990 in silver dollars, $237,418,346 in silver certificates.

THE PROPOSITION OF THE GOLD MEN.

The plan of the gold advocates is to banish legal tender silver—full one-half of the metallic currency of the world—from use and retain the gold only.

Can upright men think it would be *honest* for the Government to reduce the mixed currency of some twelve hundred millions to a single gold currency of six hundred millions, and thus compel mortgage-debtors and others, whose debts were made under the larger currency, to pay in full, when every dollar of the currency exacted by the creditor was worth two which he loaned to his debtor?

There is not a bond, greenback, or other obligation of the United States which the silver dollar cannot lawfully discharge. When these obligations were issued the silver dollar was at a considerable premium over the gold dollar, and neither on their face or in the statutes authorizing their issue is gold mentioned at all.

SUPPLY, DEMAND AND PRICE.

Supply and demand do not alone determine the price of commodities.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The amount of money in circulation is an important factor in determining price.

If we have five hundred million legal tender silver this year, and the same amount of gold, and the supply and demand for wheat in the great markets of the country is one hundred millions of bushels, and the price is one dollar a bushel, and next year the supply and demand is precisely the same, but at the beginning of next year the government demonetizes one-half the currency, does any one think that the *price* would remain the same?

When between 1872 and 1874 silver coinage was stopped in the mints of Christendom, and large quantities of silver coin ceased to be money and became merchandise, the diminution of the coin circulating medium was large, and depression in price followed as inevitably as night follows day. To fill the vacuum caused by the banished silver, gold was called in, and this increased demand for gold increased its purchasing power and diminished the price of the things purchased. It is a principle from which there is no departure, that if you destroy any part of the lawful currency you increase the purchasing power of the part which remains.

BIMETALLISM.

A bimetallic system of currency requires an open mint, free to coin any gold or silver which may be brought to it, and the right on the part of a debtor to discharge his liabilities in either of the two metals at a ratio fixed by law.

Such was the general condition in continental Europe and in the United States until 1873, and the ratio was 1 : 15½ in Europe. The ratio in the United States was 1 : 15, until fifty-five years ago we changed it to 1 : 16, and a premium on silver remained constant until 1873, when by the Act of February 12 in that year the mint was forbidden to coin or issue another silver dollar, and the gold dollar of $25\frac{8}{10}$ grains was made the unit of value. In June of the following year the dollars already issued were demonetized. Thus stood the coinage law in the United States until the new silver coinage Act of 1878.

Before the combined raid upon silver, one hundred cents of silver held a steady premium above one hundred cents of gold, and if by international treaty bimetallism is restored, there is no reason to doubt that the silver dollar of to-day will forthwith be at par with the gold dollar.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It has been claimed that a single gold currency was much more stable than a bimetallic currency.*

Objection is often made to bimetallism on the ground that we cannot have two standards of value. Bimetallism does not contemplate two standards. There is not a gold coin in circulation which is not composed of two metals melted together. One-tenth of every gold coin in the United States is copper; British gold coin is a little finer. But the English sovereign and the American gold dollar both are composed of two metals; yet each is a single standard of value—the *law* makes them so.

The paper note of the Bank of England and the American greenback are both legal tender; neither has any intrinsic value, yet in payment they can discharge any debt; this is done by the fiat of law.

If you melt gold and silver together in the ratio of 1 to 15½, and the law decrees that a coin of 400 grains struck from the melted mass shall be a standard and unit of value, it would be a single standard, and not a double one. But since gold and silver have their different uses, and some Oriental nations coin silver only, it is more convenient to keep the two metals separate; but by legal fiat make 1 weight of pure gold the equivalent at the mint with 15½ weights of pure silver. That does not make a double standard; the standard can remain as it is. If gold should suddenly become sufficiently abundant to supply all that is needed in the arts, and to furnish coin to the rapidly increasing populations, *so as to keep values on the same basis as they have been settled for centuries by the use of both silver and gold in the currency,* then there would be no necessity to unite silver with gold; but since there is no such abundance of gold, and 54 per cent. of the money in use is silver, to banish it from the currency would confuse the values of the world.

* The writer of this article, in conversation withBaron Rothschild, on the 4th of March, 1877, suggested that a single gold currency was more stable than one composed of gold and silver.

The Baron replied that the contrary was the fact, and cited England and France in confirmation of his statement, that where there was but a single standard the fluctuation was larger; that when gold was drawn from England to the Continent for any cause, all the solicitude concentrated upon the single gold standard—gold being the sole legal tender, and no one knowing to what extent it would be drawn away, all the panic and alarm fell upon it; but with a double currency like France, if gold was drawn to England it caused no panic in France, because she had a large reserve of legal tender silver upon which she could fall back, and which, of course, would not be drawn to a gold country; and repeated that a bimetallic currency was more stable than a single currency.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FALL OF PRICES, THE DEPRESSION OF TRADE, AND THE SHRINKAGE IN LAND RENTS.

Simultaneously with the fall of silver commenced the fall of price, and the two have run parallel since early in 1873.

The introduction of machinery, easy transit, and the lesser cost of production, has had something to do with the fall of commodity price; but the primal and by all measure the larger cause of the fall of prices is the stoppage of the free coinage of silver in the mints of every considerable government in the Christian world.

We have already shown that scarcity of gold did not cause the fall of silver, and that there is far more gold in the world in proportion to silver now than there was in 1851, when silver was at a premium of 3.42 per cent.

THE GOLD TRUST OF ENGLAND.

There are no silver mines of importance in the British Empire, but gold mines of vast production. To keep up the price of this metal by artificial means, she formed a trust long before the oil or sugar trust was formed in America. She gave free coinage to gold and not to silver, and the Act of Parliament—*VII.* and *VIII.* Victoria, Chap. 32—*compels* the Bank of England to purchase all gold bullion offered at three pounds seventeen shillings nine pence per ounce standard. Of course by this powerful trust gold is appreciated, and silver being banished from coinage increases the demand for gold.

It would be desirable to have England join us—with the great commercial nations of Europe—in an international convention upon the silver question. But if Germany comes in, England is not at all necessary. She was *outside* before the Franco-German war, and ever since 1816.

THE UNITED STATES.

It is not at all necessary for the United States to have any ally in this great measure. We have grown so fast that we are unconscious of our strength. But we are beginning to realize our financial resources. Let England stick to her gold monometallism, oblivious to the changes wrought by the Franco-German war and the consequent banishment of silver from the mints, and before the year 1900 she will be likely to find that her gold has largely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

departed and that London is no longer the money centre of the world.

We are told that dealing with a gold country, we must pay our debts in gold—so ;—but I trust that we have no member of Congress so ignorant as not to know that every year we produce from our mines more gold than we need to pay our balances, and that we receive more gold from Europe than we send there ; and further, that we are by far the greatest producers of silver in the world. If England owned our mines of silver she would protect silver as she now protects her gold.

Instead of trying to enhance the value of our great product by giving it free coinage,—as would England,—we strive to degrade it by exclusion from our mints.

OUR COURSE IS CLEAR.

Repeal the compulsory Coinage Act. Gradually pay off the interest-bearing bonds and the greenbacks. Allow free coinage, but restrict the coinage of silver to our own product until the other commercial nations join us in a treaty.

Upon the deposit of gold or silver coin, or gold and silver bars, let notes issue of convenient denominations, payable on demand. Thus the holder of every note would be absolutely secured by a metal deposit; the government would issue no more interest bearing bonds in order to make a basis for national currency, there would soon be no paper money not secured by gold or silver, dollar for dollar; the only necessity for circulating notes at all would be the convenience. The gold and silver now in the country, and yearly coming from the mines and from other sources, would be ample, and under the system of free coinage no more would be mined than it was found profitable to mine, and no more would be coined than was needed; the currency could only expand as the silver and gold increased, and the past history of the world demonstrates that a currency composed of gold and silver only will not become redundant. It is superfluous to add that no unhealthy inflation can possibly arise from the issue of notes secured by an equal deposit of bullion or coin. Four lines of amendment to the Banking law would allow the banks to go on the same as now, obtaining their currency like other people. The mint report of this year shows that we have abundant gold and silver on hand and coming forward to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accomplish this. England never concerns herself about the currency of other nations; much less need we. It is no more important to keep gold coin in the country than to keep silver coin, provided the silver is of legal tender and sufficient in amount to perform all the functions of needed money, *as in France*, where the currency *per capita* is about twice as much as in the United States. No considerable amount of gold coin goes abroad except to pay balances, and with a reserve of legal tender silver circulated by notes the shipment of gold would cause no more panic than the shipment of wheat.

Suppose we had seven hundred millions of legal tender silver and the same amount of gold, what matters it whether the silver or the gold goes abroad? It seems to have escaped the attention of most men, that, for the long period from 1834—when we changed the mint ratio of silver to gold—down to 1873—when we stopped the coinage of the silver dollar—the *silver*, being all that time at a premium, went abroad and the gold remained at home.

No one can give a reason, founded upon any fact, why, if the European ratio of gold to silver, 1 : 15½, were established by international convention, our silver dollar would not be fully equal to our gold dollar in the markets of the world.

It is to be regretted that the Royal Commission were not in favor of an international treaty upon the subject of silver, and the regret is the deeper when we see how plainly a large majority of the Commission had such well conceived ideas upon bimetallism, which they had not the courage to express, because, as they say, "the public mind is not prepared for it at present, * * * and those accustomed to the existing system have often been disposed to put it aside as a chimerical proposal unworthy of serious consideration." And at Section 115 they remark that "self-interest is not always enlightened;" the truth of which statement is strikingly illustrated by the course which England has taken.

Several times within the last ten years faint lights of "better times a-coming" in England have glimmered in men's minds, but they have all flickered and gone out, and each succeeding year trade has been depressed, farm rents have fallen, labor strikes have been frequent, all the industries have seemed paralyzed, and Ireland is verging upon revolt, and India is in a deplorable condition. New light, even from "self-interest," cannot be expected to dawn upon men in their dotage, bred under a system

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effete, by reason of new conditions developed in the march of events.

STRINGENCY IN THE MONEY MARKET.

To those engaged in trade, manufacturing, farming, or in any honest and useful industry, no greater calamity can happen than a tight money market, sudden, and caused by artificial contrivance. Illustrations of this abound in the Parliamentary Debates and in the writings of Lord George Bentinck.

Of all the subtle devices which the wit of man has contrived to despoil the community of their property, nothing equals the contrivance of laws which *limit the currency to gold* and require all debts to be paid in legal tender money.

When the currency is small, it is always easy for a few large corporations and rich money-lenders to combine and lock it up, and thus throw down the price of stocks, wheat, cotton, and other commodities, work a *corner* on the currency, and force those who have bills falling due to sacrifice their property to sustain their credit. Thus the market is made tight and extortion easy.

Money is not a commodity—wheat is; but wheat is not a legal tender and will not pay debts. Mr. Thomas Baring mentions the fact that in 1864 a merchant in Calcutta possessing £20,000 in gold, became bankrupt because he could not change it for silver rupees, the only legal tender in Calcutta.

Lord George Bentinck, discussing the effect of this power in the Bank of England to contract the currency, presents examples of its baneful influence. In his published letters to Croker, dated November 3, 1847, he says:

"But I will give you two or three practical examples of the working of Peel's Bank Charter Act. The act was conditionally suspended last Monday week. The week previous a manufacturer, holding £100,000—$500,000—North Western Railway debentures (guaranteed five per cent. for five years), required bank notes to meet his liabilities. He went to Samuel Jones Lloyd and desired to have his debentures discounted. Samuel Jones Lloyd refused. The manufacturer replied: 'I must *have* money.' The banker rejoined: 'I can't do it—but stay; strike off twenty-five per cent. and I will, but I give you but five minutes to consider.' The wretched manufacturer had no choice but to submit to the extortion or to suspend payments. Samuel Jones Lloyd gave him £75,000 Bank of England notes, and became possessed of £100,000 ($500,000) North Western Railway debentures. On Monday following, the restrictions of the bank charter being suspended, the Bank of England was set at liberty to discount such security at eight per cent. for three months. Jones Lloyd, consequently, on Monday, could have gone to the bank and have rediscounted for £200 what he himself four days before took $125,000 for discounting. *Is not usury like this enough to make one's blood boil?*

Many cases as bad as this, only of lesser amounts, can be cited

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in England, but Samuel Jones Lloyd, taking advantage of the tightness of the money market (which he had aided to bring on), extorted $125,000 from the distressed manufacturer; and died a few years ago, under the title of Lord Overstone—one of the richest men in England. That all may clearly understand the full meaning of Lord George Bentinck's statement about quoted, it may be well to remark, that in England, since Peel's Bank Charter Act of 1844, there is a restriction imposed by the Act that no note shall issue upon any commercial paper, however good, but only upon the actual deposit of gold; but the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer together are sometimes induced to lift this restriction in emergencies, and allow the bank to discount commercial paper, and issue Bank of England notes without any gold behind them.

NO NEED OF A TIGHT MONEY MARKET IN THE UNITED STATES.

It is estimated that we have already more than eleven hundred million dollars of metallic currency, which is all the time increasing.

Give free coinage to gold and silver both; upon the coin and bullion issue legal tender notes (like Bank of England notes) of such denominations as we need, and those engaged in honest callings may defy the extortioners to cause a stringency lasting eight and forty hours. The amount of the currency, the rail, the cable, the telegraph and the swift steamers would render a *money corner* impossible.

Gold and silver mines are worked at great expense, and the product is always limited. Inflation comes of paper money (so-called). The amount of its pernicious issue is only determined by the power of the printing press and the will of the government. Not so with gold and silver. Here nature's law intervenes and municipal laws are powerless.

Within the last half century, populations over vast territories, and the business and trade of the world have largely increased, and the needs of a large currency have also increased; but the yield of the precious metals from the mines has only kept pace with these needs, and to banish one of these metals from monetary use would bring calamity. It is inconsiderately said that the modern facilities, through checks and clearing houses, dispense with the necessity of much currency. This is a fallacy; checks and clear-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing-houses are very useful labor-saving contrivances; but so long as legal tender money can alone pay debts, they do not diminish the necessity of a large legal tender currency. The checks of paupers and insolvents, or of those who have no money behind their checks, do not pass current long. Paper credits, unprotected by money, are always pernicious; when distrust comes—as come it will—these credits shrivel like a scroll in the furnace, bringing panic and disaster in consequence.

EXCLUDE FOREIGN SILVER FROM OUR MINTS.

Tax all foreign silver the same as silver plate, and none could come in.

The object is to prevent the flooding of our mints with foreign silver. Some of our most eminent statesmen think that we can alone maintain free coinage of silver without limit, and that foreign silver cannot come here to be coined. If that is so, then the restriction could do no harm, and would be the safer course at least. It is said, with much show of reason, that foreign silver could not come here to be coined, because at our mint it takes sixteen ounces of silver as the equivalent of one ounce of gold, whereas at the European mints it requires but fifteen and a half ounces—a difference of three per cent. at least—which (adding freight and insurance) would work exclusion.

Any one familiar with the silver market of New York, knows that the difference in ratio, etc., will not work exclusion of foreign silver if we give it free coinage.

Mexico produces at least thirty-three millions of silver per annum. The Mexican dollar * has a slightly larger intrinsic value than the American silver dollar, and yet thousands and thousands of Mexican dollars are sold in Wall Street for *less* than seventy-five cents to the dollar, *payable in silver certificates!*

This gives an idea of fiat value,—that is a value imposed by law,—which makes the entire value of every greenback and a considerable part of the value of every coin issued by the United States.

THE EFFECT OF THE FALL OF SILVER UPON THE PRICE OF WHEAT AND OTHER BREAD-STUFFS.

Silver coin is the sole legal tender in India, and the coinage is free. Before the fall of silver, ten rupees of India were worth a

* The Mexican dollar weighs 27.073 grams and is 902.7 fine. The United States dollar weighs 26.729 grams and is 900 fine.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pound in London, and at that rate paid the vast annual debt of India to England. The fall of silver brought down the rupee rapidly. This stimulated the raising of cotton and especially of wheat, for remittances to London; the cheap silver is taken to Calcutta, converted into rupees, exchanged for wheat which is exported to England, and coming in competition with American wheat, puts down the American product and lowers the price of all farm products in England and Ireland, and land rents fall in consequence.

In 1879 the export of wheat from the United States was one hundred and fifty-three million bushels. The export from India for the same time was but four millions.

In 1886 the export from the United States had fallen to fifty-seven millions and the export from India had risen to thirty-nine million bushels; and the average price of American wheat fell from one dollar and twenty-four cents per bushel in 1879 to eighty-four cents during the last half of 1886.

When farm products cannot pay for the raising, tenants cannot pay rents. When landlords cannot collect rents, they cannot live on land incomes.

Since the great fall in silver, Council Bills drawn in London upon the Indian Exchequer are sold as low as 1s. 4d. the rupee. Before the fall the rupee brought 2s. To cover these bills silver is purchased at the low price of the London market and sent to India for coinage; thus the purchaser of wheat in India gets for 32 cents what before the fall of silver cost 48 cents; of course he can undersell, in the European market American wheat, and depress the agricultural products of Great Britain, Ireland and the United States, besides placing India in a lamentable financial condition, as all the members of the Royal Commission concede.

In America, bimetallism is assured. The platform upon which Gen. Harrison has just been elected President contains this declaration: "The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money, and condemns the policy of the Democratic administration in its efforts to demonetize silver."

EDWARDS PIERREPONT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IS HOUSEKEEPING A FAILURE?

YES and no. Often within the limits of income proposed, housekeeping is kept up at exaggerated expense. Comfort clashes with petty economies and inefficient service, and it is a mere question of time whether health breaks down in the process. Pretension must answer for much of this wreckage of life and life's hopes, for the unwritten spirit of the genteel housekeeping of to-day is "Give us the elegancies of life, and we will do without the necessaries." Too much is attempted in the way of decoration, elaborate service, expensive in time and effort more than money, and a general scale of living exhaustive to the last dollar of income and energy of nerves. People all try to be alike, and one cannot tell by any lack of elegancies or appointments whether his friend's income is twenty-five hundred or ten thousand dollars. All houses of this class have more or less cathedral glass, painted dinner services, niello tripod lamps and apostle spoons. King George found roast mutton and apple pie a dinner fit for royalty every day, an example to which ordinary republican families cleave with great steadiness, but they contrive it shall be set upon French ingrain damask and plate fit for a court table in looks, and sixpence worth of wafers for supper will be tied with satin ribbon, on a laced napkin with ten dollars worth of orchids and adiantum to lend their countenance. Orchids, it seems, are positively economical flowers, as they keep in condition for weeks, which is their recommendation to the housekeeper of thrifty elegance.

One would sometimes rather have more broiled bird than so much wafer napkin, and must regret that he cannot eat ribbons. In the estimates of the polite housekeeper, food eaten makes no show at the end of the year, while painted lamp shades and embroidered cushions are things of substantial credit. Wherefore, she spends as little on marketing and as much on furnishings as consists with existence. A steady eye is kept laundryward, and bath towels and fresh linen are as strictly limited as the school

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fund. Cleaning of carpets, draperies and toilet covers is put off as long as possible, instead of keeping perennial freshness. You do not think of pulling a flower out of the vases, or of asking for a cup of coffee out of hours, however late you work nights, or how much nerves long for it. There is apt to be a sad monotony in the fare, which is not always "toujours perdrix" by any means. The ex-cook, who married the coachman, will have salmon and asparagus for her Sunday dinner in her cosy Eighth Avenue flat, two weeks before "the family" think of affording it. She and Michael do not find good living lost as long as they must work by it, and they have no hands to pay for that bit of dinner, incomparably cooked, save their own. The legend remains of the rich young New Yorker, patron of clubs and swell boarding hotels, who decided to keep house himself, and was reported to all inquiring friends as "gone to keeping nigger boarding house on Fifth Avenue." The story is too true to die.

There is gnashing of teeth and gnawing of moustaches as the American family man reads the standard English advice, to estimate the rent not over one-tenth of the income. One-tenth! When no one this side the water dreams of sharing less than one-fourth his income with his landlord. Is it any wonder that literary men and others on modest salaries of $3,000 to $5,000 feel compelled to keep their wives and children in Canada or the Genesee country, where living is cheap, while they themselves fare as bachelors in the city? But high rents and pretentious habits are not so prohibitory of housekeeping as the desolating plague of servants. I do not say poor servants, for, like certain brands of cheap wines, all that can be said of them is that some are not so poor as others. The first-class servant from an intelligence office may be set down as an expense of not less than $10 a week, ordinary waste and breakage included. The trouble is not so much that she is high priced, as that she will not work at any price at all. The frowsiness she quickly spreads through a house, the chipped china, ragged damask, careless vestibule, giving a bad name to the rest of the house, not belied by fluffy chambers and smoky scented parlors, takes away all attraction from the idea of home. It is a roost rather than a nest, and the family learn to feel never so much at home as when abroad. Inefficient servants have nearly broken up the home life of America.

But if housekeeping seems a failure, boarding is no less so. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is existence on its lowest terms. Whether the subject is a young man on a salary, condemned to his crevice of a hall bedroom, or a family in a luxurious suite of an apartment hotel, with name of distinction, one has a sense of being kept in a portfolio, under lock and key, or else of being always at the wings, waiting the cue to come before the public. The expensive suites seem like upholstered sepulchres. Boarding tends neither to health nor long life. The halls and unventilated parlors, stuffy with the presence of crowded humanity; the flavor of the food kept in unsavory refrigerators; the fish and meat gone stale in the hot, rancid kitchen while waiting to be cooked; the aphides swarming on the lettuce; the rust on the celery, hourly make war with digestion, lower the vitality and charge the system with malaria. The hostess is in the hands of her servants, and cannot compel careful attendance when she would.

Not to dwell on these uninviting realities, the fact is that one wants a home to have life worth living. Individuality has this sacredness about it, that by being good to ourselves we learn to be better to others. Each person has his special tastes and needs, only ministered to in the space and privilege of home. One wants a place where he can blow eggs for his cabinet, or make a scrap-book without imposing on somebody's good humor for the paste, or have a mustard plaster nights without knocking up two or three sets of persons to get it. One wants a place of his own for the great crises of life. We must have homes to be born in, and to die in. Boarding-houses are as prompt in dismissing prospective nativities as they are in getting rid of small-pox. One can hardly cavil at their decision, but it is hard upon inexperienced women, and not a few young husbands face the most perplexing question of their lives in providing for such a flight into Egypt. Who rears a family should have a home.

If life has one dreary episode, indescribable and inconsolable, it is illness and mortality under a roof not one's own. The grisly summons is hard to bear at best, but to see the slender chances of life lost one by one for want of the commonest cares, a cup of broth at the right moment, a fire for a collapsed sufferer, delicate food for supply of strength, or quiet for a fevered patient wild-eyed at every clamorous bell and careless foot, distills a slow anguish drop by drop that any mortal is wise to spare himself and his friends.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A hundred notable instances prove that even in our hot-bed society it is possible for men and women who understand themselves to make bright, enjoyable homes, where life goes on velvet by comparison with the clipped comfort of hired homes. It needs study, shrewdness, much observation and device. To live in human society requires the principles of a gentleman and the keenness of a pettifogger. One must be prompt and careful enough to extort the consideration of cool landlords, able to cope with plumbers, and provision dealers, quite hardened to decline paying dishonest charges, and to return goods which are not what they pretend to be. Servants, even in the present bumptiousness of labor, can be coolly and steadily dealt with till they perforce learn their duty; and the whole essence of the trouble with servants is, not that they are not well paid and well treated generally, but that mistresses have not the tact and decision to demand what belongs to them, or decline imperfect attendance. Women are apt to be either tyrannical mistresses or abject ones; to impose upon servants, or endure the worst imposition from them. House management is not to be taught in schools, like frying cutlets, but it is an art to be learned by practice, and is the pleasantest alternative to literary, social, and charitable pursuits, and no woman who ever learns it can ever bear to hear housekeeping pronounced a failure.

The item of expense remains, which is the marrow of the matter to many families. If they will put pretension and imitation of other people aside, and be content to live prettily in fresh surroundings, and wholesome, comfortable, cheery ways, they can do so for less money than it takes to board in a second-rate way. More than this, it is not safe to profess. Perhaps it is enough to ask, unless one would live like the elder Trollopes, keeping a footman, with wine daily on the table, while the children never knew what it was to have a penny in their pockets. But this hardly suits Americans as yet.

SHIRLEY DARE.

IT seems strange to a person who has had a long experience of both these methods of life that there should be any hesitation in choosing between them; yet there are thousands of people in our country, of moderate means, who spend their lives in houses not their own, who certainly have reasons, such as they are, for so doing.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They allege as the most urgent argument that boarding is cheaper than keeping house. This idea is not the result of investigation, or experience, but springs chiefly from the fact that it is always more satisfactory to pay a fixed sum at fixed periods than to be always liable to a demand as the need arises, or to be encountered twice a year with numerous and various bills which the masculine head of the family cannot always comprehend. And it is true, to a certain extent, that boarding, as far as mere board and lodging go, is cheaper than a house of one's own, because it costs less *per capita* to provide food for ten people than for two; there is less waste in large joints of meat than in small ones, and there is always a certain discount made to the wholesale purchaser of supplies which is never made to the small buyer. But against this should be set off the unwholesomeness of air and food in boarding. No one who has lived at such a place can forget the closeness of its atmosphere; the odor of cooking that permeates the house and saturates even its upholstery; the vitiated air in its halls and parlors that comes from the open transoms of bed-rooms whose occupants dare not open their windows, not understanding that "night air" is, as Florence Nightingale says, the only air there is at night, and infinitely better than that which is exhausted by rebreathing over and over.

And while the food, as a general thing, may be fairly good, it is impossible to accommodate it to the varying needs of so many consumers. People cannot all eat the same things; there are certain kinds of viands absolutely deleterious to some constitutions; some that are needful to the health of others; there are delicate people, particularly women, everywhere, and in a hotel or a boarding-house they must either eat the ill-cooked morsels set before them, or satisfy their hunger, which is not real hunger but exhaustion, in their own rooms, on such substitutes as crackers, candy, or the wholesomer refreshment of fruit. Bad air and improper food entail illness, a doctor, perhaps death; none of them economic but the last.

Again, in a boarding-house, women are obliged to dress better than in their homes, or, rather, to dress more. This is not a real necessity except in their own eyes, but becomes so to them. The plain and neat attire in which a woman may prettily and properly appear at her own breakfast table, the average woman would consider quite beneath her when she has to meet twelve or fifteen

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people who will criticise her aspect, and condemn or admire it; herein is another and not a trivial occasion of expense. The superior social life of a boarding-house is sometimes alleged in its favor, but a moment's candid examination of that plea shows its futility; indeed it is one of the great objections to such a life that it becomes impossible therein to choose your own society.

It cannot be asked of those who take people to board in order to make their own living that they should exercise any power of selection among those who apply to them, except so far as their social respectability and financial solvency are secure; nor can the ordinary boarder always confine herself to her chamber in order to avoid others of the incongruous family whom she does not approve or like. In this, as in most other things, the burden of life falls more heavily on women than on men; for a man is absent all day at his business, and the evening offers to him a thousand amusements which are never open to single women, nor to the married unless their husbands choose to indulge them in such recreations.

Another argument in favor of boarding is that it allows women more leisure and relieves them from the cares of house-keeping. But is leisure the best thing for women? How do they employ it in such a life? I know there are many and honorable exceptions, but the average woman of the period has nothing to do but to dress, gossip, visit, or devote herself to that trivial amusement called shopping, which too often means wasting the time and destroying the patience of employés in shops by looking at goods these *quasi* customers never mean to buy, and inspecting bric-a-brac they cannot purchase, merely as a pastime.

And are not the cares and duties of a home the legitimate business of a married woman? Where is her life more full, more appropriate, more contented, if she be a genuine woman, than when, like the Shunamite, she "dwells among her own people"?

Then comes the most vital question of all, is a home-life or the life of boarding-houses and hotels best for children? Who does not recall with horror the pert, ill-bred, noisy children they have too often encountered at such places, with nothing modest, gentle or child-like about them? They have been deprived of all the sweet securities of home, the training of family life, the tenderness and strength of family associations; they have been unwelcome from their birth, tolerated instead of cherished, nay, how

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

often the ranks of coming infancy have been more than decimated that the wives who evade motherhood may enjoy their languor and leisure, and "take their ease in their inn"!

Is not the character of too many of our modern women, who spend their lives in a homeless condition, an unanswerable argument against a life of boarding? If there is a sadder thing than "a man without a country," it is a woman without a home; and the fact that it is so frequent a spectacle is due greatly to the indolence and false pride of our women. If only they would be content to live according to their incomes, to avoid fashion and society, whose extravagance they cannot copy or compete with, and live simply, frugally, humbly, while they can afford nothing further; if they would learn and practice those homely virtues that make home what it should be, the centre of life, and light, and blessedness in living; if they would bear their children with joyful acceptance as gifts of God, and train them in their families to obedience, unselfishness, and true service to their kind, what a social revolution would begin among us! What a generation of strong men and good women would rebuild our deteriorating country!

The family is an institution of God, the archetype and foundation of all human government; out of the family as it should be come good citizens, noble women, patriots, and saints; they do not spring from the social hot-beds of hotels and boarding-houses; they grow in the fair fresh gardens of home, the only trace left us of that beauteous and fruitful field wherein the first family of earth were set "to dress and to keep it." Now, even as then, we want to taste forbidden fruit, that is as tempting to-day as ever, and turn ourselves out into the wilderness of this world to herd with the tribes of folly and idleness. It may be said, and said reasonably, that there are thousands of single women who are obliged to board, because they are wage-workers, and must spend their time elsewhere at their several occupations; but why is it not possible for a few of these women to hire a small tenement, and take turns at keeping house in it? I think it would be more economic, more wholesome, more agreeable far, than occupying garrets or hall bed-rooms in third rate boarding-houses; and I think with a little energy and enterprise, a little economy in feathers, candy, thin shoes, kid gloves, and gallery theatre tickets, it could be done. Who will be the reformer here?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Oh ! had I a thousand girls to educate, poor or rich, I would teach them cooking and content, instead of French and the piano; I would say to them every day and everywhere, "Make for yourselves a home ; no matter how poor, how small, how limited ; if it be only two rooms on a fifth story, *have a home.*" It is a woman's sole refuge and rest, her poor crown and kingdom, perhaps, but still a kingdom and a crown. It is the one way to live that has "the blessing of the Lord which maketh rich, and He addeth no sorrow to it." Its sorrows come of our own faults and follies ; but even then we have the sacred seclusion of a home to suffer in ; the charity, the comfort, the shelter of a home to die in ; and those who have fed on the husks of boarding, but come out at last into the Father's house of home, re-echo with all their hearts and minds the refrain of the old and justly popular song,

"There's no place like home!"

ROSE TERRY COOKE.

IT may be safely and deliberately asserted that the duties of the American matron, who is also house-mother, draw more heavily upon mental, moral and nervous forces than do the stated tasks of any other class of well-to-do women on either side of the ocean. This we premise in view of the responsibilities inseparable from the position, the magnitude of the issues involved, and the meagre facilities afforded for the right performance of the work.

Our matron is not only manager, overlooker and forewoman of her dwelling, but usually caterer for the appetites of her family, and almost as usually cook in departments where the light hand and delicate task are required. Her marketing directed, if not done by herself, comes to her, an amorphous mass, from which are to be evolved order, palatableness and dainty variety. From attic to cellar she performs the heaviest part of each servant's work in planning, inspecting and revising. She is nominal comptroller and virtual co-worker with minds unregulated by the influences that have formed her's, and hands whose deftest motions are clumsy when compared with the manipulation behind which are brains and judgment. Her plans may be orderly and fair to see, and in theory flawless. As carried out by her so-called confederates, they are frequently ghastly caricatures of the originals.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That, in the face of all drawbacks, she so often creates and maintains a home worthy of the name proves that executive and administrative ability of no mean order is an essential among the qualifications for her office, and that she possesses these much oftener than her detractors have the fairness to admit.

From Solomon's reign down to the incumbency of our latest president, the price of this woman has been above rubies. In the fact that she is alive upon the earth at this day, looking diligently after the ways of her household, although seldom heard in symposia on topics like that which stands as our caption, lies the hope of the national home.

A glance at the history of the plaintiff in the case now before the public, while it enhances our respect for the woman who has dared and done, gives full explanation of the failure of our malcontent. She begins life as a raw, inexperienced girl, or a mere theorist in practical housewifery. She is fleeced and bullied by servants, bewildered by babies and hectored by the husband who cannot comprehend her "unbusinesslike methods." (Who, by the way, ever taught her any "methods" at all?) Cookery, as preached and illustrated by the accomplished professor of the art with whom she "took a course" in anticipation of her marriage, resembles actual experience in her kitchen as "Die Walküre," under Damrosch's management, the rudimentary exercises of a child's piano practice. From the inception of the undertaking it is a long pull, a strong pull and a pull up-hill.

Life, in the most modest of middle-class households, differs materially from that of thirty years ago. The twenty-four hours of the day are an exact and inexorable quantity; incomes have not kept step with fashionable luxuries; cellular tissue cannot grow fast enough to supply immoderate waste. There is twice as much to be done as of old, and "hired help" is a steadily-weakening reed. The stout-armed maid-of-all-work, who cooked, washed, ironed, waited at table, and made up the beds of a family of seven, has given place to two or more specialists with nerves and notions of their own for each household where there are "three in fam'ly." The modern home, with all the labor-saving machines invented, ostensibly, for the housekeeper's relief, is a complex machine. Like steam plow and churn, it requires a skillful engineer to run it, and these Castle Garden does not furnish. The wife, tried beyond strength and patience; the husband,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whose labor barely provides the family with lodging, food, and clothing; the children, eager for novelty, unite in declaring the whole system a failure, and agree upon the alternative offered by hotel or boarding-house.

With regard to the least objectionable of these, I would here record explicitly my opinion that home is to be found in none of them. Luxury in many, comparative indolence in all, are attainable. The sacred pale which excludes the public and secludes the household—the boundary within which character grows into individuality, which is yet fostered and enriched by the holiest influences known to earth—is leveled. People who eat by contract and in herds, and whose very bed-chambers are not secure from prying eyes and intrusive feet, soon begin to dress, look, talk and *think* for the vulgar many, rather than the beloved few. Boarding-house gossip springs up as naturally from promiscuous association, habitual and continued, as fungi from artificial deposits kept at a certain degree of heat and moisture.

What other occupation has the average woman, thus situated, than to observe and discuss her neighbors, when she has dressed herself and children for the inspection of friends and the envy of rivals? The professional laborer and the active philanthropist may defy the deteriorating influence of the caravanserai. Work, with a noble, definite end in view, is a catholicon even in infected districts. But, were there no other tenable objection to the life of the feminine occupant of a family hotel, the palpable waste of the time, energies and opportunities of a rational creature, who, from morning until night has nothing to do but amuse herself, should condemn it. Worse, if possible, is the effect of the boarding-house upon children. If kept within the bounds of their own apartments, they mope, or romp like caged things. If allowed the range of the premises, they are spoiled and lawless. The mere circumstance of being always dressed "for company" begets self consciousness, consequently, stiffness or affectation.

I wish there were time and space for the discussion here of the comparative expense of the two systems. So sure am I, as the result of observation and experience, that—taking into consideration the increased cost of dress; the temptation to divers forms of extravagance not encountered in the quiet home-circle, but which assume the imminence of obligation to follow the lead of others,—not to mention extras peculiar and inevitable to this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mode of existence, and but too familiar to all who have boarded in public or private houses,—the economy of the experiment of the retired housekeepers is more than doubtful.

What is the life worth living? One of labor and sacrifice for the highest good of others, or of personal ease and irresponsibility? At the hardest, and in the least propitious circumstances, is our housewife's lot more arduous than her husband's daily toil in warehouse, shop or office? Marriage, housewifery and motherhood are the triple vocation of at least seven out of ten women. Let each bring to the mission the systematic industry and indomitable resolution that would ensure success in business projects, and the whole face of the subject would be changed. It must not be overlooked that the outcry over the failure of housekeeping does not come from the small body of what are known as professional women—those whose work in specific lines brings them assured incomes. It would be folly for the author who can earn a hundred, fifty or even twenty dollars a day at her desk, to make her own fires and puddings. The physician whose revenue is double that of the author, can conscientiously employ a salaried housekeeper. If the teacher craves a home it must be kept for her by mother, sister or other friend.

Yet let me observe in justice to some of the world's noblest workers, that among the best-ordered households in this and other lands are those of literary women. I believe the exceptions to the rule to be extremely rare, notwithstanding popular prejudice on this head. The drill of studious application to a given subject, of logical thought and methodical division of time, tells in this, as in every department of labor.

No! the wail against the intolerable servitude of housekeeping arises from the vast body of mediocre apprentices,—who will never become adepts in the really noble art of Home-making. It is rather the lack of learning and what learning does for the whole being, than the spread of "higher education," that breeds the revolt against time-honored customs. Untrained mistresses are unfit to direct untrained servants. *There* is the tangle at which a thousand fingers, kindly and meddlesome, are picking.

And the remedy of the crying evil?

A readjustment of the comparative values of life; the acceptance, with wedlock, of the grave, solemn responsibilities that enter into the relation; a steadfast determination to conquer cir-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cumstance, to bring our work up to our standard instead of girding peevishly under the burden; to count as earth's best good, the Blessedness of giving, rather than the Happiness of receiving.

In her wonderful "Story of Avis," Elizabeth Stuart Phelps tells how the young artist was sent to Alta Mura "to ask what he wants done with you."

"Are you ready, young lady," he had said, "to spend two days copying a carrot that hangs twenty feet away from you against the wall?"

"Two hundred, if I must!" said Avis.

"She stooped to her task with a stern, ungirlish doggedness, * * * abandoned herself to the drudgeries involved in mastering the *technique* of art with a passion which added to the fire of the artist something of feminine self-abnegation."

Do we dignify home-making or painting by the illustration and suggested application? MARION HARLAND.

THE conviction that well-to-do American families find housekeeping a failure, would seem the natural result of a close observation of the boarding-house system of our large cities. In many of the finest blocks the boarding-houses outnumber the homes, and of the cheaper neighborhoods this is equally true. When it is remembered that as a rule a private house contains but one family, while the boarding-house may contain two or three, it would seem that a far larger number of people are boarding than keeping house. People with incomes varying from one to four thousand dollars a year, who have been accustomed to the smaller luxuries of city life, have very little choice in the matter; from many of them, the reply to the question, "Is housekeeping a failure?" would be, "No, but an impossibility." The low-priced but respectable boarding-houses that accommodate vast numbers of families whose income is from a thousand to fifteen hundred a year, afford a semblance of luxury, in place of the undignified struggle to keep house in such cheap rooms as they could pay for. For very little more than would hire very simple lodgings and pay for food, they obtain a share of several advantages which, borne by one family alone, would take a very much larger income to support.

They have servants, live in a house of more pretension and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in a better location than they otherwise could, and have much more variety of food. Although these advantages may be little more than nominal, there is a great deal in a name, and many people would rather be uncomfortable with certain surroundings, than comfortable in confessed poverty.

But it is not lack of means to keep house that drives people to board in the expensive neighborhoods. There we find young married people, and, unfortunately, old married people, who have kept house, and taken to boarding, people who pay for confined quarters and meals at a general table as much as would maintain a small house and necessary service comfortably, and in cases where a private table is enjoyed, the prices paid are so high that it would certainly seem to answer in the affirmative the question, is housekeeping a failure?-when the known discomforts of boarding are preferred to it and so dearly paid for.

But very rarely do we meet with boarders who prefer boarding. In all large cities there are gay and frivolous women who shirk the cares of housekeeping as they do of motherhood, and to them the fashionable boarding-house or hotel offer an escape from all duties, and leave unlimited time for the pursuit of pleasure. The far greater number of boarders, however, are not of this class. We find good housekeeping mothers bringing up children in boarding-houses; but, as they will tell you, not from choice. Ill health is sometimes her reason, but far more frequently we are told that the house-mother could not bear the burden of servants any longer; worn out in patience and in all hope of better things, she and her family deprive themselves of home and its pleasures, and are enduring a life full of discomfort, but free from care, rather than struggle further with the question of domestics.

To all but the few pleasure-loving women before alluded to, boarding offers no advantages compared with home.

The man with an income of from seven to ten thousand a year—and with less than this it would be impossible to board with elbow-room in a fashionable location—can provide his family with a good house, good furniture, good food, good clothes. But it too frequently happens that the help necessary to make all these blessings enjoyable is not to be purchased for money; that the housewife becomes worn out in her efforts to take care of her house, tormented, not aided by the servants she pays to assist

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

her, and, weary of the struggle, often to save tottering health, the dear home is broken up, and the care-free refuge of a boarding-house sought as a poor makeshift. But it must be remembered that before we pronounce housekeeping a failure, it must be given up from choice, and the boarding-house accepted as a better and pleasanter way of living, not as now, as a disagreeable necessity.

But city life is not necessarily American life, nor is the life of citizens confined to cities, and such are the high rents in many of them that a very large part of their business population reside in the suburbs, the well-to-do in the fashionable, flourishing suburban towns, and those whose incomes are very small, but who prefer a humble home to boarding, choose the growing villages, where cottages rent for two to three hundred dollars.

Here we see the happy home life of America; not, perhaps, happier that that of cities, but much easier of observation.

The doors of a city home close on its inmates and we know no more. In the pleasant suburban life we see the busy man at home after the day's business is over, enjoying his flowers and his shady lawn, or driving his family in the pleasant summer evenings. Everywhere there are evidences of the happy home life. In the smaller villages it is the same. One sees the clerk or book-keeper enjoying his smoke on his own porch, surrounded by his children. Contrast this free and wholesome life with the cribbed and confined one of a couple of rooms in a boarding-house, and it will not surprise you to know that a very large majority would say that housekeeping for them was very far from a failure.

The families who live in larger houses, and are dependent on servants for cleanliness and comfort, may be less enthusiastic; the house-mother may tell of vexations and over-wrought nerves, and speak of flying to the hotel or boarding-house to escape the necessity of employing servants; or, if her experience has been fortunate, she may indignantly deny the possibility of comparing the two states of housekeeping and boarding, the last being to her motherly mind only a means of shirking responsibilities on the part of idly disposed women.

But the families who look on the possibility of breaking up home at some future date, the date is generally very remote, and only in case the last straw should be added to the burden, will rarely speak of it as a pleasant change, but as of some terrible misfortune, to be avoided if possible.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is very difficult to generalize from the limited experience of any one person; but so far as the writer's observation goes housekeeping is never a failure. To a very few married people the boarding-house offers advantages over housekeeping. To professional people where wife as well as husband have their time remuneratively employed, the ready meals and absence of all care as to house or rooms is a boon, and a homelike abiding place worthy of appreciation.

To the entirely incapable girl-wife, married soon after she leaves school, who after a few short months of difficulties and wasteful effort, or no effort, boarding may offer a refuge from worse discomfort, and as has been said, to those married people of very small income who shun living in the cheap neighborhoods that must be their choice if they wish to keep house, boarding is an economy, and so far an advantage over housekeeping, to which, however, nearly every such family looks forward as the goal of their hopes, when circumstances improve.

CATHERINE OWEN.

No; emphatically, no. This is the way in which I would briefly answer the question, "Is housekeeping a failure?" Of course, hundreds of housekeepers fall by the wayside and are glad to take refuge in boarding-houses; yet what of that? Because there are many failures in the iron business shall we pronounce the entire trade a failure? There are failures on the stage; but shall we say the dramatic art is not worth preserving? Failure follows failure in literature; yet who would ask all authors to throw away their pens for that reason? In all these cases there is a bright side as well as a dark one. So also in housekeeping.

What does boarding do for men and women? It makes them selfish, and narrow-minded, and petty fault-finders. It is inconceivable that a person can, after some years, come out of such a life in possession of the same admirable qualities that are likely to develop in one's own home. Men may not be affected to the same extent as women, because they come more in contact with the world in their business, but nobody can estimate how much the growth of a woman's character is retarded by the aimless life in a boarding-house. Lovely traits that would be fostered in the home are nipped in the bud elsewhere. Throughout the land there are hundreds of thousands of homes where all that is noble

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and amiable in men and women is cherished: mutual love and forbearance; kindness and charity; hospitality and generosity; thoughtfulness for the welfare and comfort of others. Who will say this of the boarding-house? Who attempt to match the home-makers with an equal number of people that are satisfied to live in indolence in hotels?

My work—the teaching of cooking—has taken me into many of the States in our great union and given me an opportunity to study many phases of life. I have been in the homes of the rich, the middle class and the poor, and it seems to me that I have always found those people who keep house to be the happiest in my circle of acquaintances. Assuming this to be a correct opinion, somebody may ask why then so many folk are pleased to live in hotels and boarding-houses. But is the hotel or boarding-house really their first choice? Many couples, particularly those newly married, are deterred from keeping house by two reasons: lack of money to establish themselves as they would like, and secondly, the inexperience of the wife in the discharge of household duties. When there are but two in the family it is cheaper to board, and thus it comes about that desire is often driven off the field, and grim necessity rules. Again, it may be that there are funds enough, and experience enough, but that the wife and mother is not strong enough to bear the burdens of a housekeeper. It is, therefore, not always by choice that people flock to boarding-houses. Probably a majority of those who patronize them long for homes of their own.

Mismanagement and indolence are two of the great causes of failure in housekeeping. People do not always begin in the right way. They frequently use so much money in the first year as to become disheartened. Unable or unwilling to economize, they surrender their house and turn to somebody to make a home for them where the expense shall not be so great. But they would rather keep their house, much rather; and, were they courageous enough to resolve on retrenchment, all might be well in the end. It is the first years that are the most trying. Estimates of the rent, cost of furnishing, fuel, lights, service, and some few other things can be made, but the little unexpected expenses are a source of surprise and discouragement. When retrenchment is discussed the average husband is apt to urge a reduction of the expense of the table, yet he is quick to object to any change

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which will deprive him of the food he likes or thinks he requires. A concession here by the husband and there by the wife, and instead of failure we should have success in housekeeping. If either be indolent, however, the fault must be overcome, or a perfectly happy home is not to be expected. Something which should be provided or done to conduce to the comfort of the family is missing or postponed. In time the eyes are turned toward the beacon set upon the boarding-house, and another failure in housekeeping is to be recorded.

Despite all evidence to the contrary, however, I am firm in my belief that housekeeping in general is not, all things considered, a failure. The finest suite, in the finest hotel in town, offered for exactly the same price I pay to maintain my modest home, would not tempt me to make an exchange. Surrender the comfort, freedom and happiness of a home of one's own for luxury and laziness in a hotel? Not I! and how can any sensible woman do it if she be well, have sufficient money to carry on the house, and know how to direct domestic affairs? Let the reader pause for a moment to think what it is to have a long illness at a hotel or boarding-house; to be distressed by noise made by thoughtless and unsympathetic fellow-occupants; to be able only with difficulty to get some few simple dishes which you crave. On the other hand, if you are ill at home what a difference! There is no noise to disturb you, for the members of the household, longing for your recovery, go about silently and are ever on the alert to prevent you from being annoyed. You hunger for some particular food, and loving hands prepare it and bring it to your bedside; not to be served, bear in mind, in the unattractive dishes made expressly for boarding-houses, nor yet in those of finer quality, though possessing no charms for you, which are found in hotels, but rather in the various dainty bits of china and glassware which you prize and with which so many pleasant recollections may be associated. You become tired of seeing pictures and furniture always in the same place, and changes are speedily and cheerfully made. Gradually you become stronger, and go from one part of the house to the other, sunning yourself in a cosy corner if the weather be cold, or enjoying the flowers in your garden if summer has come. There is no restraint, save such as the doctor and nurse may impose; your house is your castle, and what may benefit or please you will be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

done. Is there any place to afford the same amount of restfulness as a well-ordered home?

It seems to me that the successes in housekeeping greatly outnumber the failures. I was almost on the point of putting them in the proportion of ten to one. Possibly even that would be too low an estimate. The degree of success varies, of course. Some housekeepers win your admiration by one thing, some by another. There is no reason to doubt that many could make their success more pronounced—I cannot refrain from writing this, even though it may appear irrelevant—by showing a little more consideration to their servants. Kind words cost nothing, and a gloomy day may be made bright saying them. Fear of fostering familiarity should not deter one. Reciprocity of friendly feeling is desirable; anything like familiarity may easily be checked.

The, to me, unfortunate necessity of jotting down my views on this subject at scant notice, prevents me from expressing them so well, so compactly, and, above all, so earnestly as I would like. For to stand up for the home, as against the hotel and boarding-house; to be ready at all times to give encouragement to those who are inclined to keep house, yet are uncertain whether it is the best thing to do; and to respond invariably and unfalteringly "No, no," to the question which forms the topic of these papers, are duties which every woman should be glad and proud to do.

MARIA PARLOA.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

UNCONSCIOUS SUICIDE.

A NUMBER of cemeteries drain into Brooklyn's sources of water supply.

Long Island City pumps its water out of an underground frog pond.

Jersey City, Newark, Elizabeth, and Hoboken secure their water from the dirty Passaic River.

Albany and Kingston have muddy supplies of water.

Philadelphia pumps up Schuylkill sewage.

St. Louis is burdened with mud and filth from the Mississippi, which has rotted its water pipes. The same is true of cities deriving their water supplies from the Mississippi, Missouri and Ohio to an alarming extent, such as Louisville, Memphis and New Orleans.

Boston's water system is polluted by a poisonous vegetable growth.

Chicago sewage so completely invests lower Lake Michigan that in summer time the hydrant water actually smells of the filth. In winter, the water, being taken from a considerable depth, is void of oxygen, the life-giving gas, and under the high pressure of the pumps remains a dead liquid, injurious to the health and productive of malaria and winter cholera.

New York might have tapped Lake George for less money than the total expense attending Croton water, which has cost upward of $80,000,000. Croton water, politically and physically, is probably the most corrupt supply extant. Mineral matter is always visible in it; in the summer it is impregnated with a green and poisonous vegetable matter.

Grand Rapids, Michigan; Waukesha, Wisconsin, and a few other and small places are probably the only ones known having perfectly pure water supplies. At Grand Rapids, the Hydraulic Company's works, and those at Waukesha, are fed by enormous springs, cases exceptional and singular in the water-works history of this continent.

Nearly all farm wells in the rural districts receive the drainage of the barns.

Not long ago, the State Board of Health of Illinois condemned nearly all the wells and water-works supplies in that State, a sweeping condemnation which might be followed in other States with an enormous decrease of mortality, if pure supplies could be substituted.

There is simply one remedy for this general and unconscious means of suicide prevalent in our municipal life as a nation; and that is for cities to turn over their water systems to private enterprise where it belongs, and where, under our constitution, it rightfully belongs. Private incorporations under their charters can be compelled to provide pure water and can be proceeded against criminally

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for any failure in that direction. A city can grant such a restrictive charter that it need not accept a water supply, at the outset, which is impure. By actual statistics it costs cities from two to five times as much to build and run their own water and gas works as it does when such enterprises are in the hands of individuals. By giving such enterprises to their citizens, they also get rid of the chief sources of corruption and theft. The English doctrine is that municipalities shall not enter into any business that private individuals will undertake. The theory of all governments, like ancient Rome, Russia, etc., is to monopolize or at least control all these matters. The water-works of Rome were built by slave labor and run by the government. This was largely true of Paris, St. Petersburg, other continental cities, in China and Mexico, while free London is supplied by private companies. The popular American cry seems to be for the government to own the railroads, telegraph and telephone systems. This is an encroachment on the theory of our institutions, and any legislation, including inter-state commerce, which goes beyond the province of police control, is a step toward the governments of ancient Rome and modern China. Napoleon's ideas of government left nothing for the people. Henry George's theory, carried to its last analysis, is to bring a Chinese state of affairs, with a fountain in a monarch, with everything vested in the people in common from a socialistic point of view. The result of this in time would be a race wholly devoid of ambition for personal aims. Henry George should remove to China, where is a true exemplification of his theories. Unless our municipal, State and National governments are made to give the enterprises to private individuals which they have usurped from the people, we shall not only continue to have impure water, enforcing unconscious suicide on all citizens, but also, in time, a centralized government wherein the citizens are void of personal ambition and all is one mass or family, with a central figure, like the Emperor of China, pulling the string.

WILLIAM HOSEA BALLOU.

II.

ZOOLOGICAL GAME PRESERVES.

THE rapid development of the South African colonies is playing havoc with the supply stations of our zoological gardens. Gnoos and sable antelopes have retreated to the wilderness of the upper Zambesi; baboons are no longer found in the neighborhood of Cape Town, and before the end of the next twenty years the agents of Barnum & Co. will have to fall back upon the villages of Brahmini, Hindostan, where some fifty varieties of monkeys still enjoy all the privileges of a New York ward politician. Their impudence and digestive abilities make them a fearful nuisance, but their daily offenses are condoned on religious principles, for the sake of their sainted relative, the god-ape Hanuman. They levy a regular tribute on the produce of every farm, but are always on the lookout for extra bonanzas, and invade even the camps of the British garrison towns, where they congregate at the tent wagons of a new commissary sergeant like office-seekers at the sanctum of a new Mayor.

F. L. FREMONT.

III.

OUR RODENT RIVALS.

PROFESSOR BURMEISTERS, in his work on the Fauna of Northern Brazil, describes the frightful insect-plagues of the Rio Negro, and remarks that "men should not presume to call themselves the lords of creation till they devise more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effectual methods for fighting mosquitoes and swamp-flies." But even in the tropics swamp-flies and gnats can at least be locally abolished by a thorough system of drainage, and the terrestrial supremacy of man, after all, encounters its most formidable rivals in the tribe of rodent mammals. Individually the largest members of that tribe are hardly a match for a half-grown boy; but their lack of relative powers is more than equalized by the versatility of their mental and physical faculties, and above all by their irrepressible fecundity. The colonists of New Zealand are the Yankees of the South Sea, as plucky descendants of North British ancestors as ever framed a pontoon bridge or constitution, but after the experience of the last fifteen years are forced to acknowledge that the rabbits thus far have proved too much for them, and that at all events the odious little quadrupeds have given them ten times as much trouble as the biped Maoris. In the course of the last fifty years the aboriginal population has decreased from 210,000 to less than 40,000, while during the same period the rabbit census shows an estimated increase of 12,500,000 per cent. In many parts of the North Island the plague has assumed dimensions defying such remedies as traps and poison, *i. e.*, the largest possible number which the resources of the colonists would enable them to destroy in that way would represent less than the current increase of the survivors. All the available cash of the island, invested in strychnine and steel traps, would barely suffice to check that increase, and would utterly fail to abolish, or even to visibly abate, the nuisance. Ferrets are doing their best, but their propagation fails to keep up with that of their enemies, and bounties have led to a rather unexpected result; scores of tramps, having conceived the plan of eking out a comfortable subsistence by *promoting* the increase of the remunerative pets, are now killing out their natural enemies and obliterating decoy trenches and pitfalls, very much after the plan of the enterprising editor who hired panders to keep up his stock of Pall Mall sensations. Aroostook County, Maine, is threatened with a similar experience by the phenomenal increase of rats, and, judging from recent reports, the city of Norwich, Connecticut, too, is being grievously terrorized by the results of nightly ratification meetings. Rats by thousands and tens of thousands congregate in the neighborhood of the wharves, and often, as by common agreement, make a dash for a warehouse or plunder a freight car, with the co-operative will of a New York boodle syndicate.

A less concentrated, but more permanent, plague is that of the Alleghany flying squirrels, the "winged weasels," that slip through every cranny of an old country-house and develop an appetite that could digest Crabbe's "Treatise on Speculative Theology." They will gnaw up an oiled pair of cowhide boots in a single night. Their needlelike teeth penetrate horn and caoutchouc. They are ravenously fond of bacon, but in stress of circumstances will carry off bagsful of hard corn and pignuts. In Eastern Tennessee their ravages often oblige housewives to hang up their stores of provender in bundles dangling from the upper rafters of the ceiling; but all precautions are in vain against the talents of a marauder that can climb, dig, jump, gnaw and crawl, as well as run and fly. The owl-eyed little pests are of semi-nocturnal habits, and make their nests in hollow trees; but even the total destruction of the sheltering forests would fail to exterminate the night-squirrel, for in well-settled districts its wriggling youngsters—seven or eight of them, twice a year—are often found in haystacks or under the floor-planks of old barns.

FELIX L. OSWALD.

IV.

WHY AM I A MISSIONARY?

THIS question is not one bounded by denominational lines, but can be answered by almost every Christian church in almost the same terms, as a non-mission church may be called a non-Christian church.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I. I am inspired by the encouragements presented. The Christian world is earnestly engaged in the work of foreign missions. It has become an established part of church work, engaging its best talent both at home and on the foreign field. The latest available statistics tell us that the following sums are being contributed annually for this great work:

32 American societies contributed	$3,011,027
28 British societies contributed	5,217,385
27 Continental societies contributed	1,083,170
Total, 87 societies, contributed	$9,311,582

With this large sum,

American societies are employing	986 men and	1,081 women.
British societies are employing	1,811 men and	745 women.
Continental societies are employing	777 men and	447 women.
Total	3,561 men and	2,274 women.

These societies have the following visible results as testimony to their faithfulness in their appointed work:

Members pertaining to American societies	242,733
Members pertaining to British societies	340,242
Members pertaining to Continental societies	117,532
Total membership in heathen lands	700,507

This is larger than the membership of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and the amount expended is nearly the same that said church spent at home last year for her own current expenses. But foreign missions have not only gained this large number of converts from heathenism, they have also the following educational work to report:

American societies have in schools	124,813 children.
British societies have in schools	434,774 children.
Continental societies have in schools	67,154 children.
Total	626,741 children.

In addition to all this, missionary ships, freighted with "The Word of Life," sail on many seas and steam on the lakes of Central Africa. Hundreds of papers, in almost as many languages, "drop their leaves for the healing of the nations." Moreover, modern missions are yet in their infancy. The past has been a time of seed sowing. The oldest American society, the American Board, was born in 1810, and of the British and Continental societies, all but six were established within the last eighty years.

II. *There is grand inspiration in the history of the cause.* Missions have always been important factors, in the providence of God, in giving to the world the civilization it now enjoys. St. Boniface is known to every student of ecclesiastical history as the Apostle of Germany, who did an untold amount of good in checking the tide of barbarism and heathenism that was rolling from the north down on to the ruins of the old empire. He died like a true soldier, receiving the mortal blow from a heathen while holding above his head the gospels he had so loved to preach. The work of Augustine in England, under commission from Gregory the Great, as recorded by Hume, is another picture of the same kind. The labors of St. Patrick in Ireland, though distorted by distance and tradition (the illegitimate offspring of history), show him to have been a blessing to his people. The work of Columba among the Celtic Picts and Scots of Caledonia is still bearing fruit, and our own fair land is still debtor to that work. Now, the methods that destroyed the cruel heathenism and bloody barbarism of the fifth, sixth and seventh centuries are again vindicating their divine origin by breaking

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

caste and cruelty in India, witchcraft in Siam and Laos, cannibalism in the islands of the sea, the conservatism of China, and the ignorance of Spanish America.

III. There is goodly fellowship in the work. Missions have given to the world the lives of such men as Robert Moffat, of South Africa; Dr. Livingstone, his son in law, of all Africa; Robert Morrison, of China; Henry Martyn, of Persia; Adoniram Judson and his wives, of Burmah; Schwartz, of India; Egede, of Greenland, and a host of others as worthy of canonization as any saint in the Roman calendar.

IV. Because missions, by the blessing of God, their author, can and do regenerate nations. They have reduced scores of languages to writing, and have given a literature to many lands. In Japan, where twenty-five years ago there was not a single paper in circulation, there are now more than in all the rest of Asia combined; more than in Russia and Spain together. She is casting away her old cumbersome alphabet, if such it can be called, and adopting the Roman letters. She is filling theatres with thousands hungering and thirsting for the Gospel. The Bible will do for Japan and other nations what it has done for England and America.

V. I am a missionary because, while our Saviour taught us to pray "Thy kingdom come," He also said, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." Praying and working must go together. That church is not truly evangelical (evangelizing) which preaches the Gospel in but one language.

MARION E. BEALL.

V.

SIBERIA AND LAND-TENURE.

THE critic, like the judge, should examine with strict impartiality, subordinating his personal predilections to an honest endeavor of arriving at a just conclusion, whether it is an agreeable one or not.

But how often do we find, rather, "the wish father to the thought"? This at any rate appears to be the case with Mr. G. T. Ferris, in his article entitled "Practice vs. Theory," in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for July, wherein he attempts to demonstrate the inadequacy of the land value tax by a citation from Mr. George Kennan's "Siberia," published in the current *Century*.

He assumes that the citation in point is analogous to a practical application of the theory.

That it is not such a case Mr. Ferris acknowledges further on by allowing the exceptions.

Substantially, the objection advanced is that insecure tenure is subversive of the best use of land, to which Georgism replies—Amen.

Herein rests the strength and potency of Georgism, so-called. It is the ultimate of the theory—it compels the best use of the natural bounties or land.

It is evident to the most superficial observer that no one can afford to waste the opportunities the land offers and continue to pay its rental value to the community in the form of a tax, especially as the tax would be the same in amount, whether the most was made of the opportunity or not.

The occupier must put it to its best use or be eaten out by taxation, just as at present the State sells the property, improvements and all, should the owner fail to pay his taxes; only we now levy a tax on land value *and improvements*.

The scheme is to shift the tax from improvements and concentrate it and all other taxes upon the value of land alone.

Ownership of land does not insure its best utilization. There is land in this country which has been owned by one family since the time of George III.,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who gave away to the original head of the family what he never saw or possessed, and which is yet in its virgin condition; not that there are none willing to use it, but because the *owner* will not permit any one to do so.

Under the George theory the occupier is secure in his tenure so long as he pays his tax, which, if he is a lessee, he pays anyhow, and if an owner has already paid in a lump sum. The only difference is that the State would receive what now a private individual pockets.

It is the present system that gives only an insecure tenure to the occupier, as is evidenced by such words in common use as rack-rent and eviction.

Mr. Ferris is unhappy in his assertion that Henry George regards government possession of land as a specific cure for social and industrial evils.

Henry George, and every one else, holds that the government, being a representative of the people in their corporate capacity, cannot have powers delegated to it which the citizen never possessed, and since he holds that private property in land is unjust, as a sequence governmental property in land must also be unjust.

The idea seems to pervade some people's thoughts that somebody must *own* the land. This is not at all necessary; all that is essential is that somebody *use* it, and, if it have an added value, due to population and social conditions, justice demands that that product be paid to the producers of it—the community; by so doing we could dispense with all the present iniquitous taxes which burden production and exchange, and thereby retard development.

Critics would be less liable to misstatement and consequent error as to what the theory is if they would first study it as expounded by Henry George in "Progress and Poverty."

BENJ. DOBLIN.

VI.

MUTILATIONS OF SHAKSPERE.

THE POET INTERVIEWED.

THE works of Æschylus, of Sophocles, of Euripedes, and of Aristophanes come down to us out of the theatres of Greece as those poets gave them to the world, and, so far as we have any record, the players of succeeding centuries continued to present them textually. So it fares with the Roman dramatic writers; we can find no trace in history or in contemporaneous criticism that any of their works underwent, during the centuries that followed their production, any reformation. The change of times, which the Roman poet claims would cause a change in the minds of men, did not seem to affect those monuments of literature. Regarding other arts, we do not find the paintings and sculpture of our great masters are subjected to alteration by the hustle and bustle of their successors. On the contrary, they are preserved with costly care. How would a new edition of Dante, of Cervantes, or of Milton, interpolated, mutilated and remade by Mr. Napoleon Tate be received and considered? What then is there in the works of Shakspere, that Messrs. Colley Cibber, David Garrick, John Kemble, during the last century should have found it proper and necessary to treat them as architects treat ruins, when they pull them down to use their materials for new structures. It is significant that these reformers of Shakspere were actors. And it is to actors of the present day we owe the new acting edition of the poet. The actors of the last century cut and curtailed sundry plays so as to leave projected the figure of the tragedian who performed the principal role. Cibber worked with that object for Betterton and the group of tragedians that figured during the beginning of the eighteen century. Garrick and Kemble tailored to fit themselves. With the advent of Macready, there came a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brief conservative period, when efforts were made to restore the great Elizabethan poet, and to remove the crust of pigment which defaced his works.

But this movement degenerated into a spectacular show. It seemed necessary to envelop the poet in overwhelming vestments and sensation scenery. The more recent productions by Henry Irving and by Charles Kean are mere puppet shows when compared with the grandeur of the Macready revivals of "The Tempest," "As You Like It," "Henry the 5th," and "Lear." But, as I remarked at the time to Douglas Jerrold who sat beside me to witness one of these revivals, "This is not reviving Shakspere, it is laying him out in state."

I can understand now how very unjust this sneer was! The profusion of great actors at that time rendered us blind to their merits. Macready, Vandenhoff, Phelps, Warde, Elton, Anderson, Helen Faucit, Mrs. Warner, Mrs. W. Clifford, Miss Vandenhoff. Ten great tragic artists all in one cast! But, in truth, the poet disappeared under the trappings and the splendid escort. Nevertheless, the passion for the original text of Shakspere, for his restoration, was very sincere on the part of the public. In obedience to its impulse, Phelps produced "Macbeth" at Sadler's Wells Theatre, and, returning to the original stage directions, caused *Macduff* to enter in the last scene of the tragedy bearing the head of *Macbeth* upon a pole. This ghastly object proved too much for the public stomach. We should remember, however, that in the time of Shakspere the people beheld the heads of culprits exposed in a row on Temple Bar. Such spectacles, being familiar, had lost their horror. If a row of nude female figures, such as we may see nightly in any burlesque, had been exposed in a similar fashion at the Globe Theatre at Bankside, in one of Shakspere's plays, there is no doubt that the Elizabethan public would have revolted. *Autres temps, autres mœurs.* During my short lifetime I have remarked that the sense of decency has shifted from the *ear* to the *eye*. Fifty years ago language on the stage was unrestrained, and frequently we heard gross and blasphemous expressions. Such would not be tolerated to-day; but the dancers of that period wore their skirts down to their ankles, and Madame Vesties, in her burlesque characters, wore tunics which did not disclose the knee. Nowadays, the ear is sensitive; so if the public can discover a phrase to which a double meaning can be applied, it is saluted with censure, while a nude exhibition is applauded, which a few years ago would have produced upon the spectators the effect of the head of *Macbeth*.

Could we interview Shakspere on the question of his mutilation by his various undertakers, the ghost might deliver himself in this wise: "If I must be disemboweled and embalmed to be retained on the stage, it is very little matter to me by whom the operation is performed! Mr. Cibber and Mr. Garrick and Mr. Kemble are not more entitled to remodel me than are Mr. Irving and Mr. Kyrle Bellew! I feel under many obligations to Mr. Alma Tadema, of London, and to Mr. Worth, of Paris. But, in truth, while walking in ghostly hours the other night in Paris, I wished to enter a *bal masque*, when I perceived on the door a notice that no one could enter without a disguise and a mask, part of the entertainment being that each personage should remain unrecognized. 'It is in this fashion,' quoth I, 'that I enter an American theatre.'"

"But I cannot fairly complain of mutilation! My fellow-managers and the actors of the Globe treated all the plays we introduced there in a similar fashion. Such works were not held in much respect by us. The gothic drama, which at that time was coming into existence, was a shapeless, and sometimes a monstrous, thing; its chaos contained a heap of fine materials, but all was confusion and disorder. If it had not been so the actors would not, during three centuries, have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been employed as we see them to-day in changing, cutting, and adding to our works, which had little or no symmetry of form. If, by accident, we treated a subject like Othello, or Romeo and Juliet, which shaped itself because the action was composed of consecutive incidents, all necessary to each other, you will find there has been no attempt to reconstruct, or to take any literary liberties with such works. If no one has taken liberties with Sophocles or with Molière, it is because their plays were perfect in design. Ours represent packages of jewels, which may be reset to suit the prevailing fashion of the period. If you will consider the English mansions, and even many of the churches that remain as specimens of our taste in architecture, they will be found to contain half a dozen styles stuck together. The Norman will be found to be patched with Elizabethan, eked out by the false classic of Charles the Second. Can you imagine any Greek or Roman building, say the Parthenon at Athens, restored or completed by the addition of an Arabesque peristyle or a Gothic wing?"

Then you do not object to actresses such as Mrs. Langtry and Mrs. Potter appearing as your heroines?

"If Venus concescended to appear as *Rosalind*, and Hebe consented to perform *Juliet*, I should be there to see, and delight in, their efforts. The boys who originally played *Cleopatra* and *Lady Macbeth* squeaked through those plays in a grotesque manner. So *Cleopatra*, foreseeing that she will be made an object of derision in Rome, to which city she will be brought a prisoner, to be shown to the populace as an Egyptian puppet, exclaims:

> "The quick comedians
> Extemporally will stage us and present
> Our Alexandrian revels; Antony
> Shall be brought drunken forth and I shall see
> Some squeaking Cleopatra boy my greatness—"

But did you find the ladies equal to the task they undertook?

"I could not see for looking! Mine eyes were made the fools of the other senses, and were worth all the rest."

By the way, before you go, may I inquire if you wrote "Antony and Cleopatra"?

"The muddle of minds and new styles of expression that you may perceive throughout the play answers the question. I had a hand in it."

I recognize it in the description by *Enobarbus* of the galley of *Cleopatra*.

"Wrong again," replied the poet, "that was written by Ben Jonson. I added the last five lines."

And so ended my interview with the spirit.

DION BOUCICAULT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED